The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. XLVIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 25, 1926 NUMBER 612

Contents

The Week 1

Editorials

To Senator Borah..... 4
Traffic in the Skies..... 7

General Articles

Church and State in Mexico.....John Dewey 9
Europe's Distrust of America.....Sisley Huddleston 11
The End of Laissez-Faire.....J. M. Keynes 13
Chameleon Words.....Rexford Guy Tugwell 16
Spanish Notes—Pathétiques.....Stark Young 17
The Critic as Artist.....Waldo Frank 18
The Bandwagon..... 19

Correspondence 20

Reviews of Books

Labor's Outlook to Life.....Eduard C. Lindeman 22
The Brutal Facts.....John Bakeless 23
Some Flowers Down a Lane....Lawrence S. Morris 23
The James Boys.....R. L. 24
More Forsyte Scandal.....Robert Morss Lovett 25
An Epic—Stillborn.....R. L. 25
Notes 26

The Week

ALTHOUGH Senator Borah's suggestion that if the Allies want their debts cancelled they ought also to cancel German reparations was evidently made with no idea that it would be accepted, it is, according to a dispatch by Edwin L. James to the New York Times, being taken seriously in Europe. At least, the possibility of a modified acceptance is being talked of—that is, cancellation of all reparations except the $4,000,000,000 bonds against German railways and industry. The old idea is revived that these bonds might be disposed of for the benefit of the Allies, apparently to American investors. It is said that Germany can well afford to pay this much, since the bonded indebtedness of industry was cancelled by the disappearance of the old mark. It is also said that European and American industrial interests would hardly consent to relieve Germany of this burden, since industry in other countries still has to pay interest on long-term securities. Perhaps this is all true. Yet it overlooks the important difference between payments made within a nation and the transfer of those payments to other countries. And it would leave America in the unpleasant situation of being the only nation having to collect from Germany. Let us hope that when the full amount of reparations come due in 1928, a more complete cancellation will seem appropriate.

PRESIDENT COOLIDGE is reported to be negotiating a plan whereby private bankers in the United States will supply a large amount of credit to farmers' coöperatives. This is an attempt to mollify the political discontent of the corn belt, and is obviously a scheme to do unofficially the same thing which the administration's Fess Amendment, rejected by the farmers' representatives in the last Congress, was to enable the federal government to do. It cannot remedy the basic disadvantages under which the farmers are suffering. Credit may be applied to assist the holding of a surplus off the market in one year to be marketed in the next; but if surpluses are a regular phenomenon it is more than useless. Perhaps the administration merely hopes to placate the farmer until the elections are over. Or perhaps it hopes to placate enough of them to create division in their ranks and so break up the agricultural opposition. But a permanent policy is necessary if the farmers are to gain much in the long run.

NEWS despatches from Mexico in the past few days suggest that the solution of the quarrel there between the state and the Catholic church may come in the manner which is reported by John Dewey elsewhere in this issue, through action by the local clergy. At least fourteen parish priests are known to have accepted the regulations of the Calles government, and resumed their office even though, as they must have expected, they are to be excommunicated. The Catholic church has evidently decided against an attempt at violent revolution, and the only alternative is an effort to come to a peaceable agreement. Meanwhile the troubled situation caused by the struggle in the neighboring republic has been a grand opportunity for the American professional anti-Mexican propagandists. They have renewed their attacks on the Mexican land

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and oil laws, announcing from day to day that American property is suddenly in much greater danger than ever before, though there is no evidence except their own that such is the case. Propaganda by American Catholic laymen also continues. We are glad to applaud the cool-headedness with which President Coolidge and Secretary Kellogg have refused to be stampeded, and continue to set their faces against intervention in a situation which by every common sense interpretation of international law is purely a domestic one.

DOCTOR DEWEY reports that the net result of the quarrel up to now has been to strengthen the position of the Calles government; and the history of the Catholic economic boycott tends to support this view. The boycott is a serious matter, certainly; but if it were to be fatal to the government it should already have revealed much more strength than has been the case. Most of the Catholics in Mexico live in poverty; and in all countries, even tropical ones, the great majority of the expenditures of the poor are not for luxuries but for necessities. If the government can survive the first month of the boycott, thereafter it can hold out longer than the people. The same thing holds true of the withdrawal of deposits from the banks: if such action does not cripple the financial system at once—and it did not—it is likely never to do so.

FIRST fruits of the new agreement between Spain and Italy have not been slow in appearing. Before the compact was a week old, Primo de Rivera had announced that Spain wants Tangier, which is at present in an international zone. If she doesn't get it, the dictator threatens to withdraw from the Riff, thereby greatly complicating the military problem in North Africa of Spain's late ally, France. Great Britain is worried by this demand because Tangier lies across the straits from Gibraltar; France is worried for the reason stated, and both of them are worried because the new treaty between Italy and Spain will greatly further Mussolini's ambition to make the Mediterranean an Italian lake, as well as forwarding his schemes for colonial expansion in Africa. It is no exaggeration to say that the present ambitions of the European powers in Africa create an international situation of grave danger, and that the character of Mussolini and his government make that danger twice as great.

THE New Republic has several times discussed the famous American Metal Company case, in which it is alleged that $441,000 was given in bribes by former European owners of that organization in the successful effort to regain possession of their $7,000,000 enterprise, sequestered by the Alien Property Custodian. A new chapter was written in the case last week when U. S. Attorney Emory R. Buckner announced in New York that all the European individuals and corporations against whom charges had been made have been dropped from the case. The only remaining defendants are former Attorney General Harry M. Daugherty and former Alien Property Custodian Thomas W. Miller. John T. King, Republican National Committeeman from Connecticut, was also on the list of American defendants until his death a few weeks ago. Messrs. Daugherty and Miller will now be tried, not on the allegation that the government was defrauded of property worth $7,000,000, but on the theory that it was defrauded of their "unbiased and unprejudiced services." The case has been set for Sept. 7 and should prove a most interesting one. Our readers will remember that from the beginning of the Senate investigation of his office Attorney General Daugherty protested his innocence and demanded his day in court. Nevertheless he refused to appear in his own defense, and his brother, Mal Daugherty, has contested as far as the Supreme Court the right of the Senate to compel testimony. Within the year the former Attorney General has burned the records of his brother's bank in Wasington Court House, Ohio, records which had an important bearing on the trial now pending. Mr. Daugherty is now to be compelled to make that public defense of himself which he has said he wants. The occasion should provide some interesting revelations as to how the public business was conducted in the halcyon days of the Harding régime.

THE situation in China continues unchanged and is of an almost unprecedented character. The country is virtually without any central government and there seems no likelihood of acquiring one. It is now four months since the combined forces of Wu Pei-fu and Chang Tso-lin overthrew the Kuominchun, the national army of Feng Yu-hsiang. Nominally these two great overlords rule Peking together, but in fact, neither will consent to the creation of a real government lest the other get control of it. Only a skeleton organization exists, and it makes no pretense of having any authority. The Cantonese remain aloof, expecting sooner or later to see a resumption of the warfare which is far more normal between the two tuchuns than their present artificial alliance. Meanwhile, foreign governments have taken to negotiating directly with the various provincial rulers, thus openly admitting that Peking no longer possesses any authority. European powers and the United States are continuing the conference with Peking officials over extraterritoriality and tariffs, but it is hard to see how anything can be accomplished by their action. At present there seems no likelihood of any alteration in the situation at least for years to come.

WORD, however, comes from Geneva, according to a dispatch to the World, that on declaration by Chao Hsin Chu, who represents China in the League of Nations, the Special Treaty Committee

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has notified Belgium that her treaties with China providing for the minimum tariff on Belgian goods and for extraterritorial rights will be abrogated when they expire on October 29. In their place China offers to sign a commercial treaty on the same lines as that with Austria. Failing this, Belgian goods will be barred from China. This action is the beginning of the new policy on the part of China in her dealing with the powers, which has been threatened ever since the meeting of the tariff conference. In the failure of the powers to agree in meeting China's demands for tariff and territorial autonomy China proposes to denounce one by one the unilateral treaties and negotiate new undertakings with the powers severally rather than collectively. The treaties with Spain, Portugal, Great Britain, France, Holland, Italy and the United States will successively become subject to the same revision. It is scarcely necessary to point out that the success of this policy depends on the strength of the government initiating it, but it is equally unnecessary to remark that the bold announcement of such a policy will tend to unify the country behind the government. No wonder the British are exercising pressure upon the Belgians to refuse to sign a separate treaty.

A CURIOUS involution of corporate finance was revealed the other day when the General Motors Company issued a 50 percent stock dividend. In other words it distributed free to its shareholders half as much stock as they already owned. But the original stock was of the "no par value" variety. It simply stood for so many shares of ownership in the assets and profits of the company. When stock has a par value, the distribution of new shares may seem like—though it is not—adding something to the property of the shareholders which they did not already own. But when stock has no par value, and its worth is quite obviously based on the value and earning power of the property, divided by the number of shares outstanding, what can be the significance of distributing to the existing owners additional bits of paper signifying ownership? Nothing whatever, except what was already evident in the company's accounts. Exactly the same result would have been achieved by increasing the number of dollars of dividend per share. The meaning of the whole transaction is simply that General Motors has been highly successful and that its owners are profiting from its success. What may be the meaning of that success is another story.

CANTON, Ohio, objects to the manner in which it has been characterized since the murder of Editor Mellett a few weeks ago. The good Cantonese do not deny the existence of a large underworld in which bootlegging, dope-peddling and prostitution flourish. They adopt the tu quoque argument, declaring that every other manufacturing city in the Middle West is about as bad; and recent reports indicate that in regard to some communities at least, their charges are correct. The story of crime conditions in Chicago has too often been told in detail to need repetition here. A survey of organized vice in Detroit made a few weeks ago by an impartial and expert agency produced a picture reminiscent of the old time western mining camps; and there is reason to believe that the same tale could be told in several other cities. The huge and rapid growth of the automobile industry is an important, though indirect cause of these conditions. Wherever cars, tires and accessories are made, boom conditions now prevail. The municipalities grow faster than their social and civic agencies; foreign sections develop with large unassimilated populations. In short, the Middle West is pioneering again, with all the disrespect for law and order which normally accompanies the pioneer; and it is doing so on a large scale which almost precludes the operation of any vigilante system.

DR. JULIUS KLEIN, Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, presents an analysis of our export trade for the fiscal year 1925-26 which is, though it probably was not intended to be, of great interest to American farmers. Total exports showed a decline in value for the year of but 2.5 percent. That is not particularly alarming. Manufactured exports increased 16 percent—apparently a matter for congratulation. But all other domestic exports, which consist very largely of agricultural products, fell off 12.5 percent. This is a commentary on the effort to market farm surpluses abroad and on the advantages of being a creditor nation. Still more interesting is the relationship of growing manufacturing exports to the protective tariff. Surely protection for the home market cannot aid industry to gain foreign customers. Surely this great list of exports cannot be dumped abroad at less than cost of production. Doctor Klein attributes the success to large-scale and efficient processes. He also says that European demand for raw materials in other countries enlarges the demand of those countries for our manufactures. "Our sales of automobiles in the Argentine, which in 1925 amounted to $30,057,958, have been directly stimulated by the steady recovery of European demand for Argentine meat, wool and cereals." The farmers face not so much the menace of protected manufacture (automobiles are not effectually protected and do not need protection) as the prospect of permanent loss of their foreign market to regions of lower costs.

GREAT credit is due to the statesmanship which brought about organization of the Passaic textile strikers within the United Textile Workers of America, and thus their affiliation with the American Federation of Labor. Divided, the organized textile workers cannot carry on the necessary struggle to improve their pitiable condition. Some may

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regret that the affiliation necessarily involved the elimination of Weisbord, who has so carefully organized and led the strike. Yet it is for the good of the strikers that he has withdrawn, since as long as he was active in the situation the employers could arouse some sympathy with their refusal to negotiate on the ground that the leaders had a Communist taint, and were stirring up discontent, not for the sake of securing for the workers better wages, hours and conditions, but of carrying on revolutionary agitation. Now it is no longer possible to make such statements with any color of truth. It is a straight issue of union recognition and decent standards. Efforts to bring victory, both on the part of the strikers and of the sympathetic public, should be redoubled.

THE British Miners' delegation has arrived, its mission has been approved by the officials of American organized labor, and its appeal should meet a generous response from Americans of every occupation and condition. The financial resources of the British miners' union are severely depleted, and though their confrères in other industries are helping as much as possible, they cannot now do what is necessary. Women and children in the mining districts are suffering from privation; even the poor relief is sadly inadequate to meet their needs. The only way so far offered to the miners' union to end the struggle has involved a surrender of status and the probability of a reduction of wages already inadequate, with no assurance of that industrial reorganization which the industry must have and which has been recommended by investigating commission after commission. The obduracy of the owners and operators, inadequately checked by the Conservative government, can apparently be overcome not by reason and persuasion, but only by economic pressure, which it is costing the miners and their families so much hardship to apply. It would be a pity if, after so gallant a struggle, they should be starved into submission. It would furthermore be a loss to miners in other countries, since the market for coal is to a large extent international.

WE suggest three rousing cheers for Mrs. Hedley V. Cooke of East Orange, N. J., who a few days ago told the local Chamber of Commerce some wholesome truths which we hope they will appreciate, but fear they won't. The C. of C. asked Mrs. Cooke to serve on a Community Advertising Committee, the purpose of which is to attract more residents—"the right sort of people," of course—to the Oranges. Mrs. Cooke told the Chamber in a perfectly ladylike manner to go chase itself. Why, she asked,

> should [you] seek to commercialize and urbanize the Oranges and drive away the main charm they possess—peace and quiet? . . . These are a necessity and a God-send to our tired commuters after a day in the big city. I realize that nothing I can do will hold back the tide of population overflowing into the Oranges from New York and Newark. But I certainly am unwilling to serve on a committee or commission the purpose of which is to encourage this growth.

This is sound sense, as welcome as it is unusual. When a residential suburb or small town grows in population, two classes are mainly benefited—the land speculators and the local business men, and even the latter find in the long run that the landlord gathers in most of the increase.

IN ITS issue of August 4, the New Republic referred to former Governor "Jim" Ferguson of Texas, husband of the present Governor, as having lost his citizenship because of being sentenced to prison. This was an error, which the New Republic regrets. Governor Ferguson was impeached, convicted and removed from office by the State Senate, which also took away his citizenship. He was not, however, the subject of any court action, which could have resulted in a prison sentence, and the New Republic is sorry to have done him an unintentional injustice.

To Senator Borah

> The statement that we are trying to undermine the independence of France, or that somebody wants to buy France, approaches the absurd. If they want to cancel their debts let them include all debts and all reparations and show that benefit of the cancellation will go to humanity and to betterment of the masses of Europe and not to the benefit of the imperialistic schemes which are now crushing the life out of people who were in no sense responsible for this war. This constant charge of injustice and usury on the part of the United States is simply not only unfounded in fact, but dishonest in purpose.

THE above quotation from your recent statement regarding M. Clemenceau's letter to President Coolidge moves us to address you—since open letters are now in fashion—in behalf of those who have great confidence in your integrity, agreement with many of your opinions, and respect for the rest, but do not wholly approve your attitude on the war debts of the Allies to the United States. As Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate you have a position of leadership in this matter equal to, if not superior to, that of the President himself. Every word of yours reverberates throughout Europe and America. The action which you may persuade the Senate to take or not to take will have its effect on the foreign relationships of the United States and on world peace for many years to come. Hostile criticism uttered by those totally unsympathetic with your approach and wishing to discredit you, you have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a right to disregard. But, in view of the weight of your responsibility, is it not well to assess carefully the disagreements of your friends?

We think we understand fairly well the ground on which you stand. You do not believe in the disinterestedness or complete frankness of any European power—no matter on which side of the War it fought. You reject the lies which were so piously uttered during the War and you detest the propaganda which spread them. The Treaty of Versailles you understand as an unwisely vindictive document, framed in the interest of those whose designs are imperialistic, like those of their defeated enemies, and unfit to bring peace and security to the world. You wish the United States to remain aloof from the League of Nations because it is based on the Treaty, is dominated by the same Powers which drew it, and is, you fear, designed to enforce its unsound provisions. Your attitude was strengthened by the reckless occupation of the Ruhr carried out by France under Poincaré. You disapprove the large military establishment maintained since the War by France for the purpose, you believe, of imposing her will on Europe and on subject peoples. You particularly denounce the forcible suppression of Morocco and Syria, in which the old policy of colonial expansion regardless of the rights of native peoples is being carried on under the cloak of respectability cast about it by League of Nations mandates.

The United States should not, you think, act as the accomplice of such European polity. To forgive the debts on the sentimental plea that the Allies, innocent of provoking the War, fought our battle without aggressive aims of their own and so can match their blood against our treasure, would be to accept the myth of exclusive Allied virtue which you repudiate. To do so while they insist on collecting huge reparations from Germany would be to make a sacrifice which would not aid European conciliation. To cancel the debts while the Allies maintain their large armies and fight their new wars of imperialism would be soft-headedly to offer aid to new aggression, without any recompense. Pleas of poverty do not well comport with some of the expenses which the French treasury still undertakes. The Europeans, for the sake of their own education, should not be spared the automatic penalties of nationalistic ambition.

In all this we have agreed with you in the past, and still follow you with few reservations. If no other considerations intervened we should go on to your conclusion that the United States ought to insist on its due, to the last possible cent. There would be no reason to ask American taxpayers to bear the burden of paying interest and principal on the bonds which financed the loans, just because European taxpayers do not wish to do so.

But we have been forced by a candid examination of the situation to recognize other facts. Have you read The French Debt Problem by Moulton and Lewis—as discerning and impartial economic experts on this question as there are in this country? There it is shown that the burden of taxation borne by the French—not of the taxes theoretically levied, but those actually paid—is already, before the government has begun to repay the British and American loans, far heavier by every test than that which Americans recently considered unbearable and hampering to economic development in this country. It is estimated that if tax receipts were increased to the utmost possible limit, and if also the army were drastically reduced and the imperialistic expenses to which you object were abandoned, and if all other possible administrative economies were effected, the French budget would still fail to balance—unless the full amount of German reparations should be received, and this the authors, for reasons stated elsewhere, believe unlikely. It is shown that the present apparent "prosperity" in France is due to the temporary stimulation of currency inflation.

The only way France can reëstablish a stable currency is to repudiate, in one way or another, a large part of the debt she has incurred to her own citizens. This debt is widely held by farmers, by professional and middle class people, even by laborers. It comprises the savings of a large part of the population. The rise of the internal price level has already in effect repudiated a large part of this debt. Economists are disagreed as to whether the French can succeed in establishing a dependable currency without repudiating it still further, either by inflation or by legislation. But it is quite clear that even if France does not pay us a cent, her large classes of government bond-holders have already suffered privation and must suffer still more.

If, after a solution of the fiscal problem is reached, economic growth in France should sometime produce a Treasury surplus, the domestic creditors of the government would surely demand reinstatement of their claims. German bondholders have already done so, but the demand in defeated Germany is necessarily weak in comparison with its probable strength in France. But such a surplus would have to be tapped to pay any considerable sums owing to the United States. It would then be a question of foreign debtors vs. domestic, with what results upon international good will may well be imagined. In short, even if everything you complain of were altered for the better, either it would be impossible for France to pay us much, or the payment would work direct and severe hardships upon French taxpayers and bondholders, and through them upon the whole people.

These hardships would be inconceivably more severe than those caused American taxpayers if they should continue to pay off the Liberty and Victory bonds. We have up to the present been bearing this burden, and still are more prosperous than ever in our history. France, however, in order to pay

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

abroad, would have to develop a surplus of exports of a size unknown before the War, not balanced by any return. This would probably mean a lower standard of living for her people, although that standard is already considerably below ours.

In addition, it is necessary to consider the effect on our own economic life of the change from a debtor to a creditor nation—a change in which the war debts play a large part. We shall have to receive the repayments, if we receive them at all, in the shape of a surplus of imports over exports, whereas for many years we have had an export surplus. The change would necessitate adjustments probably injurious to some of our exporting industries. The industries suffering most would be those at the greatest competitive disadvantage in world markets. These certainly include, in the United States, agriculture. To insist on payment of the debts will, if the insistence is successful, certainly tend to further depression of American farming.

In short, no matter what the likeness or difference in moral justification between extracting large indemnities from foes and large debt payments from associates, the economic task is, in both cases, under modern conditions, either impossible or one involving so many dislocations and hardships that its effect on future international and domestic amity is bound to be bad. We return this answer alike to those who want reparations paid and debts forgiven, and to those who want reparations forgiven and debts paid. Economic and political realism will not permit divorce of the two policies.

We hardly believe that if the sufferings the French have already undergone and are bound further to undergo do not teach them the ultimate unprofitableness of imperialism, any obduracy on the part of a foreign creditor will do so. That simply provides a scapegoat for the extreme nationalists. Many of the French people already disapprove the policies which have brought them so much trouble, and most of the rest are innocent victims of traditional statesmanship. The task of enlightening them is one for education, not punishment. And we further suggest that not only the Allies, but also the United States, need a lesson in the unprofitableness of war.

There is a further danger which is among the most serious of all. It is implied in Clemenceau's statement that France is not for sale, which you think absurd. It is explained at some length in Sisley Huddleston's article in this week's New Republic. Perhaps it is not so absurd as you think. Few close students of the subject believe, in view of the circumstances pointed out above, that the Berenger agreement to pay huge sums over a period of two generations will ever be carried out. There is reason to think that those who negotiated the agreement believe it must some time be revised. What, then, was the motive for the agreement? On the French side, willingness to promise almost anything in return for new loans from private bankers which would be granted only after a settlement. On the American side, no doubt a consciousness of the determination of Congress to collect as much as possible. But was there not something further? Was there not a desire, on the part of private interests influential with the Treasury Department, to obtain a hold on valuable French resources in exchange for the aid which France so badly needed? You doubtless remember that after it had been announced that Caillaux as special envoy had reached an agreement with the American Funding Commission, negotiations were suddenly broken off. What happened in the meantime? Did Caillaux consult private bankers on the terms of the new loan? Did he find these terms so onerous that he rejected them? And then did the debt settlement fall through? Perhaps Clemenceau knows something which has escaped your ears.

You must know that certain influential persons in the United States look forward to an Anglo-American financial imperium, a situation in which Britain and America can keep the rest of the world good by keeping it in debt, or by sharing more largely in its industrial earnings. There is doubtless some idealism in this view, but there is also the investment bankers' eye to profits. Do you really believe that if Europe remains in debt to Great Britain and the United States, and if Great Britain remains in debt to us, the cause of world peace will be advanced? What is likely to happen if the common people of Europe find their standard of living depressed for years by the draining of their national surpluses and the mortgaging of their basic industries to America?

You have a peculiar responsibility in this matter. Financial powers have been using the insistence of Congress as a reason for demanding promises to pay which probably cannot be carried out. They may easily have been endeavoring to turn these promises to their private advantage. When Europeans cry out at the encroachments and obduracy of American finance, our bankers can reply: it is not our fault, it is Mr. Borah's.

You have never had any great love for the bankers. Yet you are now, in effect, their principal ally. Of course, there may be no truth in the rumors of their designs. But at least you ought to find out. Before you say anything more about debt payments, would it not be well to investigate what the bankers have been doing and planning, whether they have insincerely backed a settlement which they know will not be carried out, in the hope of turning the negotiations to some private advantage? What loans have been extended in Europe, and on what conditions? What further proposals have been made, whether rejected or not? The Senate is the only body in the United States which can properly make such an investigation. You are the proper Senator to undertake it. The matter is of great and urgent importance. Why not investigate, Mr. Borah?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Traffic in the Skies

IS America at last to see a genuine development of commercial aviation? It now seems possible for the first time to hope so. A few days ago it was announced in Washington that two great airways have been approved for commercial use. They are already operating mail service, and within six months Secretary Hoover promises that they will be carrying freight and passengers as well, on a daily schedule. One of these is the transcontinental line, from New York to San Francisco and Los Angeles, and the other the Southwestern route, Chicago to Dallas. Several additional lines will at once be inaugurated, or extended from mail service to include the other types. These include routes from Salt Lake to the Pacific Northwest, New York to Boston, Chicago to Atlanta, Chicago to Minneapolis, Chicago to St. Louis, Detroit to Cleveland, Detroit to Chicago, Los Angeles to Seattle, Boston to Miami and St. Louis to New Orleans.

At present, the transcontinental air mail system is government owned and operated. In the near future it is planned to transfer this service to one of the private companies which will carry the United States mail under contract, just as was the case seventy-five years ago in the time of the pony express. These private operators will not be subsidized, but will be paid 80 percent of what the government receives as postage on the air mail carried by them. This money, it is expected, will just about suffice to keep them going until they can develop the passenger and freight service from which they expect to receive their main profits. In the past, numerous grandiose announcements have been made regarding commercial flying in this country, which have invariably come to nothing. The newspapers, whose short memory is their most precious asset, are forever blossoming out with long articles telling of luxurious flying Pullmans which are about to begin service between New York and Chicago, or London, or Omsk. In view of these false alarms of the past it should be added that the private companies which will work with the United States government are already in existence, and show indubitable signs of meaning business. They are amply financed, having obtained the support of some very wealthy men, including Henry and Edsel Ford.

The development which is now promised comes as the result of new legislation obtained recently by the industry from Congress after many years of battering at the gates in vain. Indeed, most of the twenty investigations of the aircraft situation in the past eight years have concluded that apathy of the government, coupled with economic and other difficulties, was rapidly causing the whole industry to disappear. Striking evidence of this is the fact that whereas in 1918 private manufacturers were equipped to turn out 20,000 planes, they would now have difficulty in producing 1,000. The new law provides that the existing government air mail service shall be turned over to private hands under circumstances which justify the hope that operations will be greatly expanded. It also sets up a new machinery for government assistance. A post of Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Aviation has been created, and Mr. W. P. MacCracken appointed to fill it. From now on, the government will provide for the ships of the air the same service it now gives the ships of the sea. Aircraft will be inspected and pilots examined, and both will be licensed. Airways will be surveyed and mapped, and lighthouses erected. Emergency landing fields will be created, at which government employes will sell supplies and make repairs at reasonable rates. Special weather reports and radio service will be provided for aviators.

The government's interest in commercial aviation is of course primarily military. If an industry already existed, it would be entirely proper for the Department of Commerce to aid it in all of the ways proposed, but the desire to create one where none now exists arises chiefly from the wish to strengthen our country's position in respect to aerial armament. While not every civilian aviator will be useful in wartime, it is from the personnel of the commercial pilots that army men can best be drawn. Again, planes used for peaceful purposes can quickly be altered for military duty.

This is true even in the United States where the army and navy have shown an extraordinary conservatism in regard to airplanes as a military weapon. (Of eighty-eight members of the Army General Staff only two have even flown a plane.) It is far more true in Europe, which is at least five years in advance of the United States in this regard—if the word "advance" can be used in regard to utilization of the most terrible of all weapons, one which will be employed chiefly against the civilian population and is sure to be appallingly effective. Not only are the chief European countries (except Germany) spending large sums on military aviation, but they are paying heavy subsidies for the maintenance of the passenger and freight lines which lace the continent in all directions. England spent last year $1,750,000 on the development of commercial flying, and France, for which figures are not available, probably used an even larger sum. The former country has a Secretary of State for Air; France has an Undersecretary for Aeronautics, and even Germany has a Department of Air Navigation in the Ministry of Transport. In the last year for which figures are available, 1924, the European commercial services carried 64,000 passengers and 2,500 tons of freight, flying a distance of 6,000,000 miles.

The success of the European service, however, affords no valid basis for predictions as to what is likely to appear in the United States. Because of the subsidies, passenger fares in Europe are not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much higher than those on trains. If the passenger had to pay his way, as he will in this country, most fares would go up so high that the thrifty European would never dream of paying them, and the airlines would be even more exclusively patronized by American tourists than now. Another powerful reason for travel by plane which does not exist on our side of the Atlantic is the discomfort of other means. Customs and border restrictions were never more annoying than now. Train service has deteriorated badly. Numerous water gaps exist, of which the English Channel is one of the worst.

All roseate predictions notwithstanding, air travel will not become important in the United States until two things have happened: it must be made much cheaper and much safer than at present. Cost will be reduced somewhat as the carrying capacity of the average plane is increased, as fuel consumption is lowered and as large scale methods of production are introduced.

Passenger safety is a more difficult problem. The public has been frightened by the great loss of life during the six years after the War—a loss nearly all of which was needless and would have been prevented if government inspection and licensing of planes and aviators had then existed. Hundreds of men bought surplus war planes from the government and used them to take up passengers on short flights. The aviators were frequently incompetent, the planes old and faulty; and as a result, 300 persons have been killed since 1918. They have died at the rate of seventy-five to each million miles traveled, while the air mail has killed only one pilot to each million miles, and the army has succeeded in using its archaic machines, rightly characterized as "flying coffins" for 900,000 miles with no deaths.

Compulsory wearing of parachutes has been a large factor in reducing the death toll among government fliers, despite their reluctance to admit that this is true, and their efforts to avoid the requirement. It is hardly practicable, however, to train passengers in parachute jumping, and the necessary increase of safety must therefore come in the machine and surrounding conditions. Numerous emergency flying fields will help; so will stronger all-metal planes, and multiple engines. Great importance is attached to new types of planes which have been flown successfully in Europe, with a horizontal set of "windmill" blades placed above the wings. These blades, either rotated by engine power or by air pressure, are of great assistance in carrying the load. They make it possible to take off from a much smaller field, and to land almost vertically, as well as stabilizing the plane while in flight. This invention may solve the problem of passenger traffic. It is safe to say that until some such radical alteration is made, air passenger service will remain negligible both in the United States and in Europe, at least when compared to the number of person-miles of railroad and automobile travel.

If the new American service cannot expect any large amount of passenger traffic, what can it carry? The most important item is undoubtedly light freight as to which time is an important element. It often happens that a small part in a factory or mine machine breaks and a new one to take its place can only be secured from a great distance. In such a case, using the air freight would be far cheaper than closing down the plant for several extra days. Retail stores will occasionally ship goods of great style value this way, or will use the air service when other means are temporarily unavailable. Photographs with news value are already often sent by airplane, as are newsreel films and prints. The private companies which are now being formed may also find some use for their men and ships in the special services which the government is now encouraging: crop dusting, aerial map-making, forest service fire patrol, timber "cruising" and crop estimating.

Advocates of government ownership in general will of course regret the transfer of the air mail service to private hands and Uncle Sam's abstention from any further efforts in the same direction. Such a policy is not surprising, however, coming from the present administration. It parallels the attitude of the Shipping Board and the attempted disposal of Muscle Shoals, as well as the whole philosophy, to which Messrs. Coolidge and Hoover are so firmly addicted, of leaving everything possible to private initiative. A better case could probably be made for subsidizing aviation than almost any other industry; but Congress is opposed to subsidies as such and therefore the assistance must be given in less direct ways. It remains to be seen whether the aid now afforded will be sufficient to surmount the obstacles which have heretofore proven insuperable, and whether in the near future the airplane is to become a useful instrument of commerce as the prophets have so long and so prematurely predicted. That such a development will take place eventually, no child of the age can permit himself to doubt. It is too characteristically in the tempo of our whole civilization not to come true in the long run.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1926, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK
HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY BRUCE BLIVEN ROBERT LITTELL
ALVIN JOHNSON GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG
ROBERT MORSS LOVETT

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JANE ADDAMS JOHN DEWEY EDMUND WILSON
GILBERT SELDES E. C. LINDEMAN LEO WOLMAN
WALDO FRANK

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Church and State in Mexico

THE events constituting the conflict of church and government in Mexico have been so fully reported in the press that there is little which a newcomer on the ground, like myself, can add. Politics and religion are the two subjects, in any case, which one cannot help approaching with a certain amount of parti pris. In this particular case one can receive about as many diverse accounts of the motives which explain the conduct of either side, and as many different prognostications as to the future, as the number of persons with whom one converses. However, there has gradually formed in my mind a certain deposit of impressions regarding the present situation and its probable movement, which I shall expose, with the understanding that it is simply a matter of certain net impressions which have emerged from the confusion and conflict of opinions, and not a claim to reveal any inner truths or hidden facts.

In the first place, the technical cause of the strike of the church is of greater importance than has been attached to it in most of the accounts which I have run across in the papers of the United States. On July 3, President Calles issued a series of regulations, giving effect, via the penal code, to the provisions of the constitution of 1917. Most of these rules were not only restatements, verbally exact, of the terms of the constitution, but they also related to accomplished facts, adding only definite penalties for cases of violation. Such accomplished facts included the dissolution of monastic orders; the denial of the right of incorporation or legal "personality" to religious bodies; the exclusion of all foreigners from the right to exercise religious functions and to teach religion in schools; the title in the state, of all properties of religious bodies (churches and objects of art, jewels, etc., in them, as well as real estate); the limitation of all religious services to the interior of churches; the denial of the right to wear a distinctive religious garb or emblems outside of churches; the denial to the clergy of the right to engage in politics, to comment on political affairs, (also denied to religious periodicals), and the complete laicizing of *primary* education, whether in public or private schools.

This legislation, embodied as already stated in the organic law of Carrazana's time which put in legal form the achievements of the revolution, and itself consummated the revolution of Juarez in 1857, is obviously drastic and thorough. Equally obvious to the eye of one acquainted with history, the constitution marked a stadium in the struggle of church and state which has been going on for several centuries in all modern nations, and which has ended in all European states in the definite subordination of the church to civil authority. What is distinctive in the Mexican laws is the extreme thoroughness with which anti-clerical legislation has been carried out. Upon this legislation itself I do not propose to comment; one's attitude toward it will depend upon one's social and political philosophy, and one's view of the nature of religion, and its connection with organized political life. The usual defense of its unusually drastic character, as compared with that of even most other anti-clerical legislation, is of course the monopolistic character of the past history of the church, its almost universal association with anti-republican tendencies, and the hold of the priests upon the ignorant rural Indian population, by which was directed its intellectual, political and economic as well as its religious activity, without any corresponding contribution to education or well-being. To this has to be added, the distinct anti-foreign phase of the nationalistic side of the revolution; the claim is made that the exploitation of the natives by the clergy, economic and political, has been greatly increased and exasperated by the presence of foreign bishops and priests, especially Spanish and Italian. This fact, or alleged fact, has a bearing, as will be indicated shortly, upon the rules and penalties which are the immediate cause of the present clerical strike.

The constitution also contained a provision, which had not previously been put into effect, that all priests and preachers should register, stating the particular church building with which their ministrations were connected, and that the registration should be vouched for by ten citizens of the locality. The regulations of July 3 set August 1 as the date by which this registration should be accomplished, assigning heavy penalties for clergy who should officiate after that date without having registered. Technically the abandonment by the clergy of all religious rites and offices, including preaching and the sacraments, turns upon this one regulation. The clergy were forbidden from above to register; and, as the method by which they would then be protected from civil penalties for failure to register, were authorized to suspend all offices.

When one inquires into the reasons and motives for this attitude on the part of the archbishops, one plunges into the arena of rumor, not to say gossip. The reason officially assigned is that this move, coming after all the other restrictions put upon the church, was of so definitely an anti-religious nature as to render it impossible for the church to exercise its God-given functions; that the regulations in their totality were contrary to divine and "natural" law, and hence null. Rumors of an extreme character are to the effect that it was hoped to create the impression that the state had itself closed the churches, thereby arousing a popular reaction which would weaken if not overthrow the government; the more moderate theory is that it was intended

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to create a popular reaction which would demand and secure from the federal congress and the state legislative bodies an amendment of the constitution. If the first expectation was entertained events have definitely negated it; upon this score, the government has won a complete victory; barring a few sporadic incidents complete order has been obtained, and the position of the government of President Calles was never stronger, perhaps never so strong. The more moderate expectation takes us into the region of prophecy; I can only register my impression that it is extremely unlikely to be fulfilled.

The position of the government is simple. The provision for registration is in the constitution; hence the resistance of the clergy is but another manifestation that the church still regards itself as superior to civil law. The registration is held to be a necessary consequence of the nationalization of ecclesiastical properties. Granted this premise, the state must know who is responsible for the care and preservation of the buildings and their treasures. Furthermore such registration is the only means by which clergy of foreign birth can be prevented from returning and resuming their activities. My own guess is this anti-foreign bias, so marked in all revolutionary "backward" countries, is the factor which counts most. On the surface there is now a complete deadlock; there are rumors of an adjustment already on foot, but they spread one day to be denied the next. To one accustomed to the legalistic procedures of the Anglo-Saxon world, it seems as if the issue could be settled and church offices resumed only by a complete surrender on one side or the other. But here in Mexico some acquainted with the native psychology say that it will be settled rather by a gradual filtration of parish priests. There are already a few cases of individual submission to the law.

There has been a schismatic movement to form a Mexican Catholic church in contradistinction to the Roman Catholic church. So far it is largely abortive. But state control of church properties gives the government some leverage. The church cannot educate the people to do without its services; there are some good reasons for thinking that the pressure of the mass of the faithful will be directed toward ensuring the resumption of the services of the church rather than toward any change of the constitution. There is no organized public opinion in Mexico; and personal opinion as to the attitude of the mass of inert and ignorant peasants varies with the attitude of the one who gives the judgment. But the church can hardly escape paying the penalty for the continued ignorance and lack of initiative which it has tolerated if not cultivated. In short, such popular organization as exists is with the government and not with the church; and this fact, as far as it goes, is the sole basis for predicting the future.

The regulations in question were issued by the President. This fact is eloquent as to political conditions. Congress even when in session does not make the important laws. It authorizes the President to issue what are in effect decrees putting the constitution into effect in this and that respect. Mexico is a republic, but effective democratic government is largely in the future. There is something humorous in the attitude of those, among whom are many foreigners including American fellow-countrymen, who sigh for the "strong-man" government of Diaz. There is a strong-man government in existence, but it operates mostly against foreign interests instead of in their behalf, as was the case with Diaz. The only well organized force in the country, outside of the army, is the labor unions, and they are officially behind the government; the demonstration and parade of August 1 proved that fact. The power of the army in politics has been much curbed, and even if there were generals willing to advance their own prospects by rebelling against the government, which is the usual method of starting revolutions, they are, by common consent, practically powerless as long as the embargo of the United States against arms remains in force.

But in my opinion "liberals" in other countries can hardly appeal to existing democratic liberalism in Mexico in support of the policy of the government. The fact of the case is that the revolution in Mexico is not completed. There is not a single manifesto which does not refer to the Principles of the Revolution; it is from the standpoint of completing the revolution that events in Mexico must be judged, not from that of legalities and methods of countries where political and social institutions are stabilized. This fact accounts for the great diversity of judgment on the present crisis which one finds among intelligent people. If upon the whole they think the revolution is a good thing for Mexico, they support the government's side though regretting the harshness with which some of its measures have been executed. If they dislike the revolution, they are quite sure that the present struggle originated from anti-religious rather than political motives. Under these circumstances, one with only a short and superficial acquaintance with Mexican conditions is perhaps entitled to fall back on general historical knowledge, and see in the conflict a belated chapter in the secular struggle of church and state for superior political authority, complicated, as it has so often been in the past, with anti-foreign sentiment. From this standpoint, one may also prophesy on general historic grounds, not on the basis of knowledge of local conditions, what the outcome will be, the victory of the national state. Again, following history, the conclusion would be that Catholics as a whole will in the end, though the end may be remote in Mexico, be better off than when they had too easy and too monopolistic a possession of the field.

Mexico City. JOHN DEWEY.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Europe's Distrust of America

I WONDER whether a frank statement of French fears with regard to America, and of French resentment pushed so far as to repudiate prospective American financial aid, would be welcome in the United States? Let me first make it clear that there will be no discussion in this article of America's debt policy. I do not propose to take sides in the controversy that has been stirred up in England as well as in France. Whether the United States should—or can—collect what is owing to them by Europe, whether the money lent was spent in a common cause, whether a clean slate would not have been better for the world—these are matters on which I pronounce no opinion, and indeed I exclude them from my survey. It is to a single point which has been raised in France that I would direct attention. That single point is the apprehension that undoubtedly exists of the Americanization of Europe.

Strange as it may appear, you may read in responsible French newspapers—which are merely reflecting a widespread political view and a national instinct—protests against the possibility of France's becoming a vassal state. The War was fought—so we are told—to prevent the domination of Europe by Germany. The word Hegemony was ridden to death. Hegemony was the great bugbear. When one said Hegemony it was like pronouncing some dreadful Arabian word which would release maleficient genii from their bottle-prisons. Hegemony and Mesopotamia were at opposite poles in our vocabulary: while Mesopotamia (or, as the British Foreign Office will have it, Irak) was the blessed word, Hegemony was the cursed word. Hegemony was the unspeakable crime which Germany was trying to commit. To repel Hegemony millions of men lost their lives, and a number of countries fought to the verge of bankruptcy. If one fixes this fact firmly in one's mind, it will not be difficult to understand the emotion created by the suggestion that America is acquiring, or may acquire, a hold on Europe. Did we escape German domination, cry certain Europeans, simply to fall under American domination? Is Europe to be enslaved? It is not so much the tribute which England, Germany, France, Italy and so forth, are expected to pay, directly or indirectly, to the United States for several generations, that distresses Europe: that is bad enough in itself, but what is worse is the likelihood of America's strengthening her grip on Europe by reason of Europe's inability to pay the tribute over a long period.

What will happen if there is a breakdown? What will happen in almost any case? If European politicians are to be believed, American interests may obtain a preponderant position in Europe. The indebtedness of Europe can be turned to advantage: it is not repayment, so much as the use that can be made of indebtedness, that is dreaded. Some time ago Lucien Romier, who may be described as a philosopher turned politician, predicted that Europe, after a facile exploitation of the globe for a hundred years, would now find herself deprived of markets which properly fall into the American zone, while America (and incidentally Japan, but this does not concern us here) would invade the European markets. It is not only an invasion of markets, however, which is now foreseen, but a positive control of European industry and even of European policy.

I

I am anxious to state the reasons of this anxiety as soberly as possible. I have no desire to indulge in sensationalism. Yet it seems to me highly necessary, if we would have a genuine explanation of our times, if we would understand a European sentiment which is not always articulate, that we should try to penetrate a little more deeply into the psychology and the reasoning, conscious or unconscious, of thinking Europeans. No better starting point can be taken for such an inquiry than the report of the experts in France which aroused the greatest opposition. M. Caillaux succumbed to that opposition, and M. Poincaré came back to power, in a country which had two years before rejected him at the polls, on the crest of that opposition. It was not that France meant to repudiate her debts—that is far too simple a motive: it was a sudden resolution not to incur further debts. The danger of foreign indebtedness was seen in a flash, and if France had the means she would, I believe, make almost any sacrifice to pay off the old debt and not to exchange it for a new debt. It will be observed that this is virtually the contrary of most of the commentary that has been written.

The French experts and M. Caillaux evolved a scheme which, put in a few words, amounted to this: the stabilization of the franc was to be effected following the ratification of the Washington agreement, with or without modifications and reservations, and the conclusion of a similar accord with England, since such ratification was the essential preliminary condition of further foreign loans. France, in other words, was to depend for salvation on outside help, and to secure that outside help should accept terms which need not be examined too closely. Italy had arrived at a settlement in order to secure further assistance. Italy had gone deeper into debt instead of getting out of debt. The same course was recommended to France. Now France became aware of the peril of this procedure. If it was true that the Mellon-Berenger accord

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would, according to this argument, put France at the mercy of America, it was truer that the borrowing of more money to stabilize the franc would put France still more at the mercy of America. Moreover, an economic crisis might compel French industrialists, sooner or later, to accept private American aid. The price might be redoubtable. It might be that France would resemble a man in financial difficulties who mortgaged his property, and then, to acquit himself of his liabilities, mortgaged more property, and so piled up his obligations that at a given moment his creditor was able to take possession of his property. Against this easy transaction there was an unexpected revolt. M. Caillaux was overthrown for several reasons into which we need not enter, but I affirm that the central reason, the determining reason, was a consciousness that France was placing her fate in foreign hands.

The cry went up that France must save herself. She did not want to be saved by others. That the proposed debt settlement was felt to be unfair cannot be denied, but this feeling, in my opinion, was not the most important consideration. The most important consideration was the realization of France's increasing dependence on America. Belgium had pledged her patrimony, American money was engaged in Italian business, the Dawes plan imposed on Germany was, so to speak, financed by America and was being carried out under American supervision. If American money put France on her feet again, it might be loaned under such conditions as to make France subservient. Sometimes the phrase Anglo-Saxon finance is used, implying that England and America have joined hands, but generally American finance is alone meant.

II

I can perhaps best make clear what is, after all, often a vague idea, by referring to a remarkable letter which was published in L'Avenir, the most nationalist of French newspapers. It was not endorsed by L'Avenir, but it was not printed without purpose. It came from a German industrialist, Arnold Rechberg. In his exposition—which I, too, refuse to endorse, but which nevertheless I believe to reveal a thought that is stirring in men's minds on this side of the Atlantic—Rechberg asserted that American interests were seeking to appropriate German heavy industries and afterwards to appropriate French heavy industries.

When the period of inflation ceased in Germany and the mark was stabilized, German heavy industries found themselves short of working capital. They tried to manage for some time, but in the end had to capitulate. Obliged to turn to America, they found a readiness to assist them, but that readiness was conditional. Banks, alleged to be backed by the steel magnates of the United States, launched a loan destined for the German heavy industries, only on the understanding that there was American participation in the shares of the companies. Rechberg, rightly or wrongly, warned the French that the policy was to obtain more and more participation in German affairs, particularly in the steel trade, with a view to America's command of the majority of the shares. Now the German heavy industries, through the Hugenberg association, largely control political power. They can make their influence felt in an overwhelming number of conservative newspapers, in most of the patriotic societies, and in the nationalist party. Thus the eventual result of these operations should logically be a predominant intervention of America in German economic and political life.

Not for a moment do I suggest that, even though this be true, the proceeding is unfair. I do not suggest that the consequences will be disadvantageous. Indeed Rechberg admits that peace might be forwarded by an interpenetration of interests, for obviously warlike utterances would be regarded as inimical to the various interests involved. But one can understand the attitude of alarm of the German industrialists, and when Rechberg goes on to declare that France may find herself in the same boat, it is natural that French resistance should be aroused.

III

Assume that for the sake of further credits France ratifies the debt accord. Assume that France is unable to honor her engagements. What will be the next step? The mere mention of a Dawes plan for France causes perturbation. Would French property have to be pledged? Would American capital be needed by the French iron masters? These are the questions Rechberg asks, and he answers his own questions by adumbrating a Franco-German coal and iron consortium manipulated by Americans. His proposal, in reply to such a prospect, is interesting. He would have France forestall America by purchasing shares of the Stahltrust by means of the millions of gold marks held by the Reparations Agent in Germany, marks which cannot be transferred because of technical difficulties. Once acquired by the French government, the shares could be sold to Frenchmen with the stipulation that they must not leave the country for thirty years. In this manner a Franco-German bloc could be consolidated. The collaboration between the two countries would be to their mutual benefit and, to some extent at least, American influence in Europe, and particularly in the heavy industries of Europe, would be counterbalanced.

Emphatically do I repeat that there is altogether inadequate evidence of such designs. But it is not of paramount importance, in this explanation, to ascertain whether in fact far-reaching projects have been formed, or even whether, without conscious projects, events may automatically move in the direction foreseen by Rechberg. Nor does it matter

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

overmuch whether many Frenchmen have read Rechberg's letter, and whether they have taken it to heart. I insert it rather by way of illustration of the suspicions which American policy, directed by Washington or by Wall Street, not unnaturally causes to germinate. There may not be a word of truth in these specific suggestions. But there is a profound psychological truth in the assertion that distrust of America, justified or unjustified, has developed in Europe. Perhaps few Frenchmen could indicate in plain language precisely what they fear. Yet when every oratorical precaution has been taken, when every reservation has been made, one must confess that France shares with other European countries an aversion to the loss of her economic and political independence, and that this aversion, openly manifesting itself, is responsible for the rejection of the experts' and the Caillaux plans, and for the demonstration which attended and followed the second advent since the War of Poincaré. There is no nerve which is so sensitive in France at the nerve of nationalism.

I am aware that there is a good deal in this article which may fall unpleasantly on American ears, but it is written honestly, disinterestedly, objectively, with a conviction that many Americans would wish to understand the currents which are flowing in Europe, and to determine their action en connaissance de cause. France may be forced to borrow abroad once more, but it will be against her inclination. Politicians often ignore evils which they suppose to be remote and hypothetical. But the wave of opinion in favor of France saving herself, of avoiding any kind of servitude is unmistakable. It will be well, perhaps, though the mistrust is to be deplored, if France is stimulated to the necessary exertions.

SISLEY HUDDLESTON.

Paris.

The End of Laissez-Faire

I

THE disposition towards public affairs, which we conveniently sum up as individualism and laissez-faire, drew its sustenance from many different rivulets of thought and springs of feeling. For more than a hundred years our philosophers ruled us, because, by a miracle, they nearly all agreed, or seemed to agree, on this one thing. We do not dance even yet to a new tune. But a change is in the air. We hear but indistinctly what were once the clearest and most distinguishable voices which have ever instructed political mankind. The orchestra of diverse instruments, the chorus of articulate sound, is receding at last into the distance.

At the end of the seventeenth century the divine right of monarchs gave place to natural liberty and to the compact, and the divine right of the church to the principle of toleration, and to the view that a church is "a voluntary society of men," coming together in a way which is "absolutely free and spontaneous." Fifty years later the divine origin and absolute voice of duty gave place to the calculations of utility. In the hands of Locke and Hume these doctrines founded individualism. The compact presumed rights in the individual; the new ethics, being no more than a scientific study of the consequences of rational self-love, placed the individual at the centre. "The sole trouble virtue demands," said Hume, "is that of just calculation, and a steady preference of the greater happiness." These ideas accorded with the practical notions of conservatives and of lawyers. They furnished a satisfactory intellectual foundation to the rights of property and to the liberty of the individual in possession to do what he liked with himself and with his own. This was one of the contributions of the eighteenth centry to the air we still breathe.

The purpose of promoting the individual was to depose the monarch and the church; the effect —through the new ethical significance attributed to contract—was to buttress property and prescription. But it was not long before the claims of society raised themselves anew against the individual. Paley and Bentham accepted utilitarian hedonism from the hands of Hume and his predecessors, but enlarged it into social utility. Rousseau took the social contract from Locke and drew out of it the general will. In both cases the transition was made by virtue of the new emphasis laid on equality.

II

Paley and Bentham reached the same destination, but by different routes. Paley avoided an egoistic conclusion to his hedonism by a god from the machine. "Virtue," he says, "is the doing good to mankind, in obedience to the will of God, and for the sake of everlasting happiness"—in this way bringing back *I* and *others* to a parity. Bentham reached the same result by pure reason. There is no rational ground, he argued, for preferring the happiness of one individual, even oneself, to that of any other. Hence the greatest happiness of the greatest number is the sole rational object of conduct—taking utility from Hume, but forgetting that sage man's cynical corollary: " 'Tis not contrary to reason to prefer the destruction of the whole world to the scratching of my finger. 'Tis not contrary to reason for me to choose my total ruin to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prevent the least uneasiness of an Indian, or person totally unknown to me. . . . Reason is and ought only to be the slave of the passions, and can never pretend to any other office than to serve and obey them."

Rousseau derived equality from the state of nature, Paley from the will of God, Bentham from a mathematical law of indifference. Equality and altruism had thus entered political philosophy, and from Rousseau and Bentham in conjunction sprang both democracy and utilitarian socialism.

This is the second current—sprung from long-dead controversies, and carried on its way by long-exploded sophistries—which still permeates our atmosphere of thought. But it did not drive out the former current. It mixed with it. The early nineteenth century performed the miraculous union. It harmonized the conservative individualism of Locke and Hume with the socialism and democratic equality of Rousseau and Paley.

III

Nevertheless that age would have found it difficult to achieve this harmony of opposites if it had not been for the *economists,* who sprang into prominence just at the right moment. The idea of a divine harmony between private advantage and the public good is already apparent in Paley. But it was the economists who gave the notion a good scientific basis. Suppose that by the working of natural laws individuals pursuing their own interests with enlightenment in conditions of freedom always tend to promote the general interest at the same time! Our difficulties are resolved. To the philosophical doctrine that government has no right to interfere, and the divine miracle that it has no need to interfere, there is added a scientific proof that its interference is inexpedient. This is the third current of thought, just discoverable in Adam Smith, who was ready in the main to allow the public good to rest on "the natural effort of every individual to better his own condition," but not fully and self-consciously developed until the nineteenth century begins. The principle of laissez-faire had arrived to harmonize individualism and socialism, and to make at one Hume's egoism with the greatest good of the greatest number. The political philosopher could retire in favor of the business man—for the latter could attain the philosopher's summum bonum by just pursuing his own private profit.

Yet some other ingredients were also needed to complete the pudding. First the corruption and incompetence of eighteenth-century government, many legacies of which survived into the nineteenth. The individualism of the political philosophers pointed to laissez-faire. The divine or scientific harmony (as the case might be) between private interest and public advantage pointed to laissez-faire. But above all, the ineptitude of public administrators strongly prejudiced the practical man in favor of laissez-faire—a sentiment which has by no means disappeared. Almost everything which the state did in the eighteenth century in excess of its minimum functions was, or seemed, injurious or unsuccessful.

On the other hand, material progress between 1750 and 1850 came from individual initiative, and owed almost nothing to the directive influence of organized society as a whole. Thus practical experience reinforced a priori reasonings. The philosophers and the economists told us that for deep reasons unfettered private enterprise would promote the greatest good of the whole. What could suit the business man better? And could a practical observer deny that the blessings of improvement which distinguished the age he lived in were traceable to the activities of individuals "on the make"? Thus the ground was fertile for a doctrine that, whether on divine, natural, or scientific grounds, state action should be narrowly confined and economic life left, unregulated so far as may be, to the skill and good sense of individual citizens actuated by the admirable motive of trying to get on in the world.

By the time that the influence of Paley and his like was waning, the innovations of Darwin were shaking the foundations of belief. Nothing could seem more opposed than the old doctrine and the new—the doctrine which looked on the world as the work of the divine Watchmaker and the doctrine which seemed to draw all things out of chance, chaos and old time. But at this one point the new ideas bolstered up the old. The economists were teaching that wealth, commerce and machinery were the children of free competition—that free competition built London. But the Darwinians could go one better than that—free competition had built Man. The human eye was no longer the demonstration of design, miraculously contriving all things for the best; it was the supreme achievement of chance, operating under conditions of free competition and laissez-faire. The principle of the survival of the fittest could be regarded as a vast generalization of the Ricardian economics. Socialistic interferences became, in the light of this grander synthesis, not merely inexpedient, but impious, as calculated to retard the onward movement of the mighty process by which we ourselves had risen like Aphrodite out of the primeval slime of Ocean.

IV

Therefore I trace the peculiar unity of the everyday political philosophy of the nineteenth century to the success with which it harmonized diversified and warring schools and united all good things to a single end. Hume and Paley, Burke and Rousseau, Godwin and Malthus, Cobbett and Huskisson, Bentham and Coleridge, Darwin and the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bishop of Oxford, were all, it was discovered, preaching practically the same thing—individualism and laissez-faire. This was the Church of England and those her apostles, whilst the company of the economists were there to prove that the least deviation into impiety involved financial ruin.

These reasons and this atmosphere are the explanations, whether we know it or not, why we feel such a strong bias in favor of laissez-faire, and why state action to regulate the value of money, or the course of investment, or the population, provokes such passionate suspicions in many upright breasts. We have not read these authors; we should consider their arguments preposterous if they were to fall into our hands. Nevertheless we should not, I fancy, think as we do, if Hobbes, Locke, Hume, Rousseau, Paley, Adam Smith, Bentham and Miss Martineau had not thought and written as they did. A study of the history of opinion is a necessary preliminary to the emancipation of the mind. I do not know which makes a man more conservative—to know nothing but the present, or nothing but the past.

V

I have said that it was the economists who furnished the scientific pretext by which the practical man could solve the contradiction between egoism and socialism which emerged out of the philosophizing of the eighteenth century and the decay of revealed religion. But having said this for shortness' sake, I hasten to qualify it. This is what the economists are *supposed* to have said. No such doctrine is really to be found in the writings of the greatest authorities. It is what the popularizers and the vulgarizers said. The popularity of the doctrine must be laid at the door of the political philosophers of the day, whom it happened to suit, and not of the political economists.

The phrase laissez-faire is not to be found in the works of Adam Smith, of Ricardo, or of Malthus. The idea itself is not present in a dogmatic form in any of these authors. Adam Smith, of course, was a free trader and an opponent of many eighteenth-century restrictions on trade. But Adam Smith's advocacy of the "obvious and simple system of natural liberty" is derived from his theistic and optimistic view of the order of the world and not from any proposition of political economy proper. The phrase laissez-faire was, I think, first brought into popular usage in England by a well known passage of Doctor Franklin's. It is not, indeed, until we come to the later works of Bentham —who was not an economist at all—that we discover the rule of laissez-faire, in the shape in which our grandfathers knew it, adopted into the service of the Utilitarian philosophy. For example, in A Manual of Political Economy, he writes: "The general rule is that nothing ought to be done or attempted by government; the motto or watchword of government, on these occasions, ought to be—*Be quiet* . . . . The request which agriculture, manufacturers and commerce present to governments is as modest and reasonable as that which Diogenes made to Alexander: 'Stand out of my sunshine.' "

From this time on it was the political campaign for free trade, the influence of the so-called Manchester School and of the Benthamite Utilitarians, the utterances of secondary economic authorities, and the educational stories of Miss Martineau and Mrs. Marcet, that fixed laissez-faire in the popular mind as the practical conclusion of orthodox political economy—with this great difference, that the Malthusian view of population having been accepted in the meantime by this same school of thought, the optimistic laissez-faire of the last half of the eighteenth century gives place to the pessimistic laissez-faire of the first half of the nineteenth century.

In Mrs. Marcet's Conversations on Political Economy (1817) Caroline stands out as long as she can in favor of controlling the expenditure of the rich. But by page 418 she has to admit defeat:

> CAROLINE.—The more I learn upon this subject, the more I feel convinced that the interests of nations, as well as those of individuals, so far from being opposed to each other, are in the most perfect unison.
>
> MRS. B.—Liberal and enlarged views will always lead to similar conclusions, and teach us to cherish sentiments of universal benevolence towards each other; hence the superiority of science over mere practical knowledge.

By 1850 the Easy Lessons on Money Matters for the Use of Young People, by Archbishop Whately, which the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was distributing wholesale, do not admit even of those doubts which Mrs. B. allowed Caroline occasionally to entertain. "More harm than good is likely to be done," the little book concludes, "by almost any interference of government with men's money transactions."

In short, the dogma had got hold of the educational machine; it had become a copybook maxim. The political philosophy, which the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries had forged in order to throw down kings and prelates, had been made milk for babes, and had literally entered the nursery.

From the time of John Stuart Mill, economists of authority have been in strong reaction against all such ideas. Economists no longer have any link with the theological or political philosophies out of which the dogma of Social Harmony was born, and their scientific analysis does not lead them to these conclusions.

J. M. KEYNES.

(This is the first of a series of articles. The second will appear next week.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chameleon Words

I HAVE never been able to get used to the way certain words are commonly used. One of the first difficulties of this sort I ran into many years ago was when I began to be aware that to certain people the word "Christianity" seemed to have a meaning of some sort which would not make its home in my mind. Looking around at the individuals who professed Christianity, I could discover plenty of data for definition, but no possible way of synthesizing it so that the term could become a minted reality, ready to use. It seemed to me then, and it still seems to me that such words as this can be useful only in such a general sense that the dangers of their misuse are perhaps greater than their contributions to the expression of ideas. For people still talk about what a "Christian gentleman" will do when they are very evidently using the term with a flavor of self-reference; and they still speak of a "Christian civilization" which includes elements plainly un- or anti-Christian to an undialectical mind. War and Imperialism are obvious supporting citations.

Of course the intellectual toes of an economist do not suffer very often from being stepped on by theologues. But they do have to suffer bruises of a very persistent sort from the heels of amateur economists, though I should be the last person in the world to attempt the setting up of any professional tests for the title "economist." It is far from certain, indeed, that the amateurs of our science have not on the whole supplied most of the vital ideas of economics. But the professional economist has a justifiable grievance, especially if he is sensitive about language, when the mouthing of terms which are quite as bad as "Christian" becomes common, and especially we resent the way in which "capitalism" is used. If any reader will stop to think in how many places and with how many connotations he has seen the word used, say, in the last week, he will begin to seize upon the essence of my complaint.

It seems unthinkable that we should allow such a crystallization of meanings about this word that we are forced into either an attitude of offense or defense against all the congeries of arrangements, institutions and associations which comprise our going economic system. May not one conceivably feel that he does not approve of some and does approve of some other aspects of economic life? If he favors industrial unionism, the regulation of prices, the abolition of tariffs, science in management, voluntary control of the size of population, employers' associations and the repeal of the Sherman act, where will he be placed? Obviously, if he is a person of any importance, there will ensue a struggling among "capitalists" and "socialists" to range him among their number or to read him out of the party as the case may be. Some of these opinions endanger his "socialist" affiliations, others make it clear that he does not assent to all the arrangements of contemporary industrialism. Presumably, therefore, he is not a "capitalist." All this comes from the indoctrinization of economics, from creating a series of orthodoxies, from turning idealists into economists. Your typical idealist must have all or nothing. He neither understands a willingness to compromise nor an unwillingness to affiliate. He makes of such a term as "capitalism" a fetish which covers every current industrial arrangement, and of "socialism"—simply its antithesis.

But "capitalism" has evolved; that is, industrial arrangements have changed. And if "capitalism" was "capitalism" *in 1890, nothing seems clearer than that it is something else now.* The confusion into which we fall by the inheritance of old terms and the uncritical continuance of their use is easily illustrated. Recently, for instance, Mr. E. J. B. Benn, a prominent English publisher of trade journals, has written a book which is called The Confessions of a Capitalist. In my reading of it, it gradually seemed to become clear that by "capitalist" he meant "entrepreneur," and that he really wanted to go back to the old nineteenth century industrial organization which, compared with our present large scale organization, was small in size, made possible a direct relation between owners and workers, and generally led to higher productive morale. But in a chapter on America, he praised our system highly; and it soon appeared that he thought we had somehow preserved the system he believed best. Any American, however, knows that he was mistaken. His kind of "capitalism" is dead in America. And if what he praised is "capitalism" we do not have it at all. A term which can spread over two such inconsistent systems of economic organization as these has ceased to be exactly descriptive at all.

Another good illustration is furnished by the report called The Secret of High Wages, written by Messrs. Austin and Lloyd, two young English engineers, upon what they were pleased to call the "American industrial wonder." They sought to discover the secret of our productive efficiency for the benefit of English industrialists. And among other things they deplored England's trend toward "socialism," citing us as an example of the "unparalleled success of capitalism." What they mean by this, it finally turns out, is that we do not make our machinery so well that it outlives its usefulness, that we promote by merit, that we try our best to save effort rather than to make it greater, and that we do not guard our trade secrets jealously. A good many Americans might have mental reservations concerning the universal truth of these observations of our industrial life; but I, at least, am puzzled to know how they are identified with "capitalism." If we are to believe the socialists all these benefits would be enhanced under a socialist order. The question immediately arises whether, if we arrange things so that we get all these benefits, we should then have "socialism" or "capitalism." When we put it this way we see that we should have neither, but would have simply a series of compromise arrangements worked out from the data of experience rather than from any one set of premises. If we clearly understand that such a system is neither "capitalism" nor "socialism" we are in a far more favorable situation both for operating under current arrangements and for criticizing their inadequacy. We withhold nothing of energy or loyalty because our ideals are violated; and we criticize solely because things do not work well. And this is the only criticism which can carry weight nowadays.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The importance of a plea for giving up such terms as these is really a plea for giving up doctrinaire attitudes, for using the test of consequences rather than premises. I have seen too many employers fight battles for a principle, even when the specific change which was being sought was admittedly good. And I have seen too many socialists struggle against the introduction of patently wise reforms on the ground that they simply mitigated the hard conditions of an essentially rotten system of capitalism. If once we could get our minds free from the bias of terms we should become at once wiser in the realities of an industrial system with which we must all live and through which the only salvation we can have must be worked out.

REXFORD GUY TUGWELL.

Spanish Notes—Pathétiques

LA GRANJA

THE palace and gardens of La Granja, seven miles only from Segovia and not too far from Madrid, were built for Philip V, Louis XIV's grandson, who had to give up France to be king of Spain, and his wife Isabella Farnese, who brought from Parma so many of the treasures in the Prado now. The grounds themselves, and the farm from which the estate takes its name and which is enclosed within the palace plan, were given by Isabella the Catholic in 1477 to the monks of Parral, and from them purchased by Philip and turned toward a recreation in Spain of his beloved Versailles and beloved France.

La Granja is a chateau, huge and rambling, in the style of Juvara's period. It is something like Versailles, with more charm, more delight, a more roseate color and gracious mood. It combines no little of the Spanish magnificence and informality. And in this Spanish air it looks strangely new and suave, with its pilasters and statues and terraces, its cream and yellow and rose-colored stone.

It was the Farnese princess who had the most famous and most distinguished part of this royal estate designed and executed. During a long absence of the king she planned this surprise for him, and had built, four thousand feet above the sea, a lake from which water might come to feed the fountains. And if the king, as he is said to have done, declared that these fountains had cost him three millions and amused him three minutes, it is no matter now, they are the finest in Europe, far finer than those of the Versailles that he had left. Over the palace gardens they spread, at the end and intersection of avenues of trees, in cascades looking toward the palace façade, off toward the maze of labyrinth, now a jungle, and farther away where the avenues lead straight toward vistas of mountain, violet, blue, with patches of snow even in June. The jets pass a hundred feet in height, and on clear days can be seen for miles; and for the fountains the power of the water feeding them and the flood of it makes an infinity of motives and elevations possible.

The fountains of La Granja play, now that the palace is but seldom a residence of the king, only at special times, on the days of various saints, in January, August, July for instance. For the most part they are silent, their basins are dry. But their designs appear as freshly as if set there yesterday. Gods and goddesses, Neptune's triumph, Perseus and Andromeda and the Dragon, Apollo and the vanquished Python, Latona and the Phrygian peasants converted into frogs, the Bath of Diana, where the goddess bathes in the midst of her maidens and animals and nymphs and shells, and others, three hundred fountains in all. They are of lead painted white with rose tones appearing. There are columns and arches, elegant pedestals and urns, figures, everything in the French manner of that first half of the eighteenth century, everything startlingly preserved in its chic, everything persistently urban and French and elegant and slight, strangely thin and elaborate against the trees, the superb country and the mountains beyond.

ARANJUEZ

If La Granja is little known to tourists and to students of art, Aranjuez is even less known; and if the king and the royal family come rarely to La Granja they never come to Aranjuez at all. Aranjuez was a Roman site, and somewhere in the country around there are traces of Roman villas in the fields. Isabella the Catholic came here for a favorite summer residence, Charles V built here a shooting-box, which afterward his son Philip II enlarged, planting the parks with the English elm introduced into Spain for the first time, and laying out his parterres amid the trees, to be seen to this day. When the mob in 1808 stormed the house of Godoy, Charles IV's favorite, who had built so many colonnades and gardens there, the end of Aranjuez had come. Next day the Bourbon king abdicated in favor of his son, and from that hour this vast house has stood empty, not ruined but not inhabited, strangely fresh in the fine, dry Spanish air, strangely remote and unreal, gracious, suave and forgotten. In the midst of the level plain, surrounded by trees and gardens, by colonnades, chapels, the water of the Tagus and the tall elms that Philip brought, this Bourbon palace is farther than the pyramids from the modern mind.

But back of the palace and running for miles are the gardens and parks, kept up as a farm and opened as a resort to Spanish visitors from Madrid and motorists and holiday-makers come for an afternoon. In a quarter circle around one side of the palace are parterres, walks, avenues, gates, marble and stone seats, numberless urns, statues, busts and fountains derived from the Bourbon extravagance in Spain. The grandson of Le Roi Soleil, coming unwillingly from Versailles with his French tastes and French conviction that no other country could be safely admired, to be king of Spain, imported foreign artists with him; and after him Bourbon kings, some of them brought again from other capitals, as Charles III from the throne of Naples and his huge palace at Caserta, went on elaborating their mood and clinching their pride and passing their endless vacant hours by ordering these vast establishments to be created. They found a Spain already set toward ruin. Fine talents, fine influences from abroad had been in Spain, had worked magnificently, had been slowly beaten by the Spanish will. The Italians, bent most on the expression of beauty, pure in itself, and however complicated or academic, working toward the expression of itself for its own sake, found themselves more and more forced toward

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those two elements that most appear in Spanish art, both forms of the same thing, both riches, one of them religious devotion, the other magnificence of material, gold, marble, gems.

It must be the reminder of this older magnificence, something that for all its coarseness of grain and harsh, lush power, had gone farther than anything ever done under the Bourbons in Spain, or in France either for that matter, that lingers in these gardens at Aranjuez and gives them a depth of beauty and pathos that is so unlike the quality that La Granja has to offer. The echo of this old richness, the tremor of an old excess is everywhere in this low, green level land of Aranjuez, and contrasts with that Parisian adequacy of the other place and that smart, unshaken urbanity of the La Granja garden in its high, rare, light-shaken and idyllic world of nature.

It may be that the baroque here at Aranjuez is older for the most part in character—the fountain basins especially—designed with more solidity than those lighter forms at La Granja; and that through this baroque character a more perfect and moving union with the natural, with tree trunks and leafy boughs and varied greens and foliages, derives; for there is nothing so apt in gardens as the baroque, especially in its harsher or more extravagant aspects.

And finally at Aranjuez, as you go farther into the park and toward the long curve of the river, the fountains move into the wood. The walks and drives and paths do not lead so surely and handsomely up toward vistas and arrangements as they do at La Granja, but bring suddenly the poignant surprise of an old basin under the tree, a strong, elegant shape in tawny stone, worn through time, with gods, with nymphs, with tritons, birds and beasts, pyramids and urns, a single figure or a group, full of the poetry of trees and stone together, of an old grace and a long silence.

STARK YOUNG.

The Critic as Artist

TO an American, M. René Lalou's recent critical volume, *Défense de l'Homme*, brings a disquieting emotion. M. Lalou, in this work, avows two masters: to one, Descartes, he owes his method; to the other, Edgar Allan Poe, he credits the first full-blown theory of pure poetry and the first practice of pure criticism. And this is disquieting to me, because I behold in Poe's own land a contemptuous disregard for his example matched only by our unawareness that in criticism, as in all behaviors of the mind, we shall get nowhere without a method.

It is this which moves me now, not so much to analyze or criticize Lalou, as to employ him. The criticism, he says, can be an art. We shall see presently why it must be. But it is not, and cannot be, a science. Perhaps the recognition of this in our own world where applied science is so abjectly worshiped explains why with us the criticism is disreputable. It seems that our practitioners, admitting the subjective element in their work to be unscientific, had flung to the desperate extreme of letting the criticism lapse to an undisguised confession of gossip and of fancy. Lalou's response is otherwise. "To declare, frankly, that the criticism is not a science is but to insist the more upon its rigor, the better marking that what concerns us is an artistic rigor. . . . All arts have a subjective side, in spite of which they reach reality. . . . "

But, comes the objection, the criticism has a mere practical goal. "It is a pragmatic form of literature, subjected to the need of giving information. In discussing the criticism of a literature produced from day to day, we accept implicitly and in its least equivocal form, this matter of utility: this need of marking trails in a forest that is growing. The criticism which is an art will neither refuse all that comes into it, nor absorb it indistinctly. Its rôle will be to compose with the actuality; or if you prefer, to compose the actuality itself in order to compose the æsthetic critical work. . . . The problem dominating æsthetics," he continues, "is that of the external inspiration and of the artist's response to it. Mysterious duel, according to those poets who claim for their inspiration a divine origin. No critic will deny that his point of departure is a human stimulus, calling forth a human response. The entire act is in the mind; that is, in the fullest light. Poetry is defined by two traits: representation and evocation. The criticism also must represent and evoke. The difference is less in nature than in proportion. . . . The realm of the criticism is not the unconscious, but the conscious; not the soul adventuring, but the mind at grips with culture. A method would seem even more necessary here than in poetry, if that 'more' were possible; and yet the criticism is the place where those very critics who demand it elsewhere seek method least."

Finally, declares Lalou: "the criticism is either parlor talk for the moment following tea, or it subsumes, and clearly, a metaphysical affirmation. To begin a critical article is to make, implicitly and explicitly, an act of faith in the universal nature of the human mind; it is to proclaim that there exists in thought a geometric locus where all minds meet. As the dramatist aims to touch the universal springs of terror and of pity, so the critic this centre of the reason. . . . "

Criticism, then, for René Lalou, is not alone a synthetic art like painting; an art, I mean, whose components are the images of actual events (books, here, in lieu of forms). It is as well an *art of living*. This brings us to Descartes and to the significance of Lalou's title. Descartes, aside from his work in mathematics, was primarily a defender of man. As a metaphysician, he strikes me as meagre and as faltering; he was far more enslaved to the mediæval schoolmen than is generally conceded. But as one who established the moral, æsthetic and religious autonomy of reason, freeing it from its mediæval service to canons of History and Faith, Descartes was great. It is this aspect which Lalou engages. If the reason can compose Reality from the apparitions of the senses then the chaos of our literary output becomes to the artist-critic the same sort of æsthetic challenge that is the chaos of the world of facts to the Cartesian. "Within the demands of actuality, the pursuit of a method will be not a clog, but an incitement. Abundantly has the surfeit of contemporary books been deplored; let us recognize in it rather an advantage. Before the twenty or thirty volumes which each week brings to him the critic is like an organist before his keyboard. Let him honestly lead his adventurous mind through

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this jungle of human invention; let him discover the themes that wind within it and call out their ramifications; let him discern that which can at once be lifted into permanence, that which merely puts a finishing touch to an epoch's portrait; finally, with this metal let him forge what will be either his sword or his plough-share. . . . "

In this matter of a metaphysical conviction, as implicit and explicit in the true critical work, we are at the heart of the disease rotting the American critic. The metaphysical conviction comes very simply down to this: that the critical work *can* reach reality, that it *can* become a part of the Real and as such function in and work upon a world of real values. From this affirmation will rise the temper of seriousness, the incentive to perfect a method to perform a serious work, the enlistment of such capacities as loyalty, sympathy, lucidity, ruthless rigor. A morality, in other words, at the behest of a method. The critic so directed and so equipped will be engaging in the major task of the modern mind: the constructing of Wholes—æsthetic, intellectual, social—out of the modern chaos. But from the lack of this metaphysical conviction will as ineluctably ensue the converse of all these: cynicism, indifference, slackness, slovenliness, bad or frivolous temper, disdain of method, exhibitionism, impressionism, "colyumism," egotism, self-contempt, self-induced contempt for life —all the traits, indeed, which distinguish the American critic of our day and which make of him a mere troubler of already troubled waters, a sower of more chaos in our modern chaos.

Having no incentive to establish, by method of his own, a law of what is real and true within the confusion of our unleashed world, he unconsciously accepts some outworn dogma, or is content with attitudes. Having no comprehension of the whole, he relies on the judgments of his mood. Since there is within him no implicit faith of any universal measure, he is submerged by the superficial chaos of events about him, and is content to pick from them the momentary grace of some swift rejection or acceptance, and the balm of the mob's accompanying gesture. He is buffeted about by the very materials he should compose and dominate. And, since he has no true leadership to offer to the crowd, he is swiftly enslaved to the whims and winds of its chaotic blindness. He is in the *organizing* position; the position of strategy. For by rights, his criticism, in so far as it becomes an organism which touches reality, conjoins the reality of the work of art and the reality of the world's need of the work of art. And in this conjunction only is there culture. Without this critical function, these two realities in art and public remain potential, remain unfulfilled, since they are complete only when they absorb each other. And this is manifestly true, since the work of art is contingent on a cultural world which accepts it, and since the human mass, as it becomes a cultural world, finds its expression through the work of art.

In this light, consider the case of René Lalou. He achieved fame through a History of Contemporary French Letters (translated into English by William Aspinwall Bradley) in which he discussed minutely the flora and fauna of that crowded world and yet succeeded in making of his book a single, evolving, illuminating structure. In his latest volume, he proceeds with his good work. It is divided into three parts. The first is a discussion of criticism as an art-form. The second and third are examples of his method, dealing with The Idea of Pure Poetry in France and with the Idea of Man in the French Psychological Novel from Descartes to Proust. In both cases, a complex literary history, ranging through centuries, achieves the focus, the composition and the dynamic destiny whereby any material becomes a work of art.

When I hear of American young men fresh from college, adopting a method for understanding life, practicing a technique in a study of life, mastering a knowledge of what the masters learned and of how they learned it; and then, and only then, proceeding to the local paper to ask for novels to review, I shall know that American literature will be about to come into the greatness predestined for it by the spiritual wealth of the American world.

WALDO FRANK.

The Bandwagon

INFLUENCE OF AMERICAN TRAVEL ON THE PARIS THEATRE

Summer revues now playing in Paris include Quel Beau Nu! at the Concert Mayol; Toute Nue, Madame, at the Moulin Bleu; Trois Jeunes Filles Nues at the Bouffes-Parisiens; Une Petite Femme Nue at the Théâtre Comœdia, and Cent Jeunes Filles Nues at the Cigale. The Gaiety will soon reopen with Elles Sont Toutes Nues!

—Paris Herald.

[APPLAUSE AND LAUGHTER]

There was no illegal act committed during the primaries in Pennsylvania. Nothing was even done that was not in good taste. *—Senator Reed of Pennsylvania.*

PEACE-TIME OPERATIONS OF THE NAVY

Secretary Wilbur has approved a recommendation of the Bureau of Aeronautics, concurred in by the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, also concurred in by the Bureau of Navigation and the Office of Naval Operations, to lift the ban on chewing gum for sailors.

—New York World.

ATTENTION MR. WAYNE B. WHEELER

American prohibition enforcement representatives were entertained at luncheon yesterday at Claridge's Hotel, the menu including Amontillado Sherry, Zeltinger Schlossberg, 1921, Chateau Marquis d'Alesme Becker, 1898, Cachet du Chateau and Exshaw's Brandy.

—London Daily Mail.

THE BIG FOUR

The four most important characters in history, according to the results of a questionnaire distributed by the Christian Young People's Union last year among the youths of more than fifty nations, are Jesus Christ, Napoleon, Mussolini and Henry Ford, in the order named.

—Paris Herald.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

A Story of Philosophers

SIR: Will you allow me to answer, as briefly as I can, Mr. *Paul Weiss's* review of my Story of Philosophy?

(1) Mr. Weiss believes that my "perspective has been seriously distorted . . . due to a tendency to deprecate logic, sneer at metaphysics, exalt psychology and interpret each contribution in terms of the individual's life and epoch." This is largely true: I do consider the social, ethical and psychological aspects of philosophy more important than the futilities of logic and the abstractions of metaphysics. But I did not sneer at metaphysics; Mr. Weiss has here interpreted after his own fashion my gentle distaste for German fairy stories. On several occasions (as in the section on William James) the case for metaphysics was stated rather vigorously; and the chapters on Spinoza and Kant are nothing if not metaphysical.

(2) Mr. Weiss complains that Spinoza is treated as a psychologist; did he pass over the exposition of the metaphysical portions of the Ethics? Does he think the proportion of metaphysics to psychology in Spinoza is greater than in my chapter?

(3) He is grieved because I prefer Aristotle's Politics and Ethics to "his more momentous Organon" (of logic) and his Metaphysics. Yet I braved the wrath of the lay reader by writing five pages on Aristotle's contributions to logic, and later dilated on the great influence of the Organon in the Middle Ages. But of course I prefer the Politics and the Ethics. Does the young man suppose that I should have filled with logical formulas and metaphysical minutiæ a book designed to offer to the untrained reader the fairest face of philosophy? Mr. Weiss, having just graduated from City College, looks with baccalaureate scorn upon an attempt to interest the intelligent general reader in philosophy.

(4) He complains that Kant's Critique was "evaluated as a 'detailed biology of thought'"; does he not understand that this was merely a metaphor for his dearly beloved logic?

(5) He takes exception to my scholarship for writing: "Locke had written a masterpiece of psychological analysis without so much as mentioning the soul"; does he not know that this was Voltaire's famous remark about Locke's essay; that I used it in partial summary of Voltaire's thought; and that the statement, in all but a childishly literal sense, is true?

(6) He denies that "at the age of twenty-six Hume shocked all Christendom with his highly heretical Treatise." He is profoundly right; the book was written at twenty-six, but not published till a year or so later (I am off in the woods with no date-book at hand). It is a mortal hit, and should entitle Mr. Weiss to a Ph. D.

(7) He objects to my attributing "innate notions" to Kant. Where in all my pages did I use this department-store phrase? I invite Mr. Weiss to point out any errors in the chapter on Kant. I thought I deserved a pat on the shoulder for daring to expound the Critique to people unprepared in philosophy.

(8) He complains that I view the Spinozistic attributes as one. Nonsense; I explicitly interpret them as two aspects of *one substance* (pp. 193-4).

(9) His remark about Russell's Analysis of Matter is correct; I wrongly supposed that this was the English title of the A. B. C. of Atoms.

(10) He regrets my "overweening desire to find psychological bases for philosophic systems" in the life-history of their authors. I do not regret it.

(11) He objects to my suggestion that Comte's love for Mme. de Vaux colored his later philosophy (the exaltation of feeling, etc.). The objection leaves me unmoved.

(12) He objects to my query about Schopenhauer: "How should a man avoid pessimism who has lived all his life in a boarding-house?" Evidently my humor was wasted on Mr. Weiss's desert air.

The editors of the New Republic could not know that Mr. Weiss has been a favorite enemy of mine for some years. That my book should have fallen into his hands is a coincidence that must have caused some merriment among the gods. I understand a little better now Job's anxiety that his enemy should write a book.

WILL DURANT.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

SIR: I do not know what years of deep research and intensive study in philosophy have qualified Paul Weiss for his strictures on The Story of Philosophy. But I do know that about a year ago, he essayed a criticism of Dr. Will Durant's Essay on the Philosophy of Kant—and Doctor Durant's rejoinder, which, like the criticism, appeared in one of the Haldeman-Julius publications, was devastating in its thoroughness and effectiveness. Mr. Haldeman-Julius properly called it "an intellectual spanking."

Under these circumstances I shall continue to hold to John Dewey's estimate of The Story of Philosophy as a thoroughly scholarly work rather than to your reviewer's evaluation. The flaws he picks are obviously minor and I have no doubt that Doctor Durant can easily answer them. And as for the long complaint against the stress laid by the book on the social and psychological sides of philosophy, as against logic and metaphysics, is that not absurd in view of the author's preface which declares his intention of emphasizing the social rather than the metaphysical problems of philosophy?

This social emphasis is just what lay students of philosophy have needed in order to make some meaningful contact with it. And it is discouraging to find that so real a contribution to liberalism and education as The Story of Philosophy should receive so little appreciation in the columns of the New Republic.

J. G. PROCTOR.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

SIR: As a friend of Will Durant's I am prejudiced in favor of The Story of Philosophy; but I feel entitled just the same to enter a protest against the review of his book in your issue of July 28, by Paul Weiss. . . . To one who has read the book, enjoyed its style and its subtle humor, and learned from it to love the philosophers, Paul Weiss's petty fault-finding seems about the most ungenerous thing ever printed. . . . When men like Professor Pitkin and Professor Dewey speak so well of the book we can only conclude that something must be wrong with Paul Weiss, and that the New Republic has been unintentionally unfair to a work which it should have been the first to acclaim. . . .

WILLIAM J. PERLMAN.

Lackawaxen, Pa.

SIR: In view of Doctor Durant's lengthy reply to my review it would, perhaps, be ungracious to point out that he has referred to only part of my objections and has particularly overlooked mentioning any of the fabricated stories which I took pains to point out. But to refer to the specific issues that Doctor Durant has seen fit to notice—

(1) Emphasis on sociological implications rather than on logical development and metaphysical significance is unexceptionable, except in so far as one desires a *balanced* survey. It is the attempt to find psychological bases for metaphysical doctrines that seems to me particularly vicious. A causal relationship between a philosopher's mundane adventures and his speculations can be established only by means of gratuitous assumptions. Even if the causal ground for a particular viewpoint could be found it would be irrelevant to the meaning or portent of the doctrine. Emphasis on psychological causes can only result in a misunderstanding of the nature and significance of philosophy, for it is to treat the whole in terms of a part.

(2) Spinoza's Ethics is a metaphysic pure and simple. Whatever there may be in it that pertains to human relationships is a deduction from the axioms and definitions postulated regarding the character of the world. There is no psychology in Spinoza, in the common sense of the word, and to think so is to misunderstand him.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(3) That it was a difficult task to achieve popularity without distortion I pointed out in the first paragraph of the review. The Organon and Metaphysics give Aristotle as *philosopher*. If their explication was impossible, the attempt to write an accurate, worthwhile, popular treatment of Aristotle should have been abandoned. Better nothing than half-truths.

(4) In neither sense, metaphorically or literally, is Kant's work "a detailed biology of thought." The Critique is no treatise on logic.

(5) That Locke firmly believed in a soul can be seen from his first letter to the Bishop of Worcester; (it is unfortunately too long to quote). Locke was a religious man, and to forget that is to misunderstand him.

(6) Also, it shocked nobody but Hume, for the Treatise was still-born.

(7) Doctor Durant's own words are a sufficient reply. Page 408, "The notions of quantity and cause which Kant supposed innate." If Doctor Durant's invitation is made seriously I shall be glad to point out to him in detail the various misconceptions which occur in his treatment of Kant. Let it suffice now to say that the stimulus-response explanation of synthetic judgments a priori (p. 293) can find no sanction in the pages of the Critique, and is wide of the mark.

(8) On the same page, 193, I find "Mind and body do not act upon each other because they are not other, they are one." This is false whether Doctor Durant means modes or attributes, the only two possible senses. This is vital to an understanding of Spinoza.

(10) and (11). See (1).

(12) The "boarding-house" remark was followed by the illegitimate child story. Was that humor also? Is it not false? And just before (p. 373) by—"the natural response to such a philosophy is a medical diagnosis of the age and of the man." Emphasis on the pessimism of Schopenhauer, though a common practice among those who haven't read him, misses the important consideration that it was a conclusion from his premises and not a starting point. Schopenhauer's case is an excellent illustration of the fact that a predominant concern with the human-interest aspects of philosophy means distortion.

(13) It is news to me that I am Doctor Durant's favorite enemy. Only once before did I complain regarding his inaccuracies. Reference to that correspondence will show to a scholar that none of those objections were met. That I was free from personal animosity in the present review is manifest from the praise accorded Doctor Durant's style, humor and clarity. In fact, some of my comments were so flattering that the publishers have considered them worthy of quotation in their advertisements. If, however, opposition to mythologies, inaccuracies and misinterpretations makes me Doctor Durant's enemy, then I must willy-nilly accept the designation.

PAUL WEISS.

New York, N. Y.

A Real Job in Passaic

SIR: Your correspondent Mrs. Myra Marini writes from Passaic, N. J., asking feminists and others to suggest "a real job for her mind that will help pay for the drudgery of the home." It seems rather amazing to me that Mrs. Marini could ask such a question in face of one of the most dramatic human struggles in history now taking place at her very door. I refer of course to the struggle of the 15,000 textile workers, almost half a year old, a struggle which even if settled in the not too distant future, will still call for the interest and support of intelligent people everywhere.

While the strike is still in progress, there are a dozen full sized jobs which any public spirited mother might take over—jobs to lessen just a little the unbelievable drudgery of the thousands of mill working mothers in Passaic. May I suggest for example that Mrs. Marini offer her services:

1. To one of the two kitchens where one thousand children of strikers are fed daily.

2. On the playground in Garfield where strikers' children are taken daily for all day care.

3. In the women's councils which meet weekly. Speakers are eagerly sought for on a variety of topics, child care, feeding, hygiene, etc., etc.

4. In raising funds for strike relief. All the funds for relief have been contributed by strike sympathizers, mostly working people throughout the country, and the distribution of relief, in the hands of workers, unpaid for their services, has been remarkably efficient. If this aspect of the work interests Mrs. Marini, I suggest that she offer her services at the strike relief office, 743 Main Avenue.

5. In raising her voice in protest against the continued brutalities of the police in dealing with strikers, and against the false statements issued by the "Citizens' Committee," a strike-breaking agency.

After the strike is settled, intelligent citizen support will be necessary to help the union in its struggle for continued recognition, to see that the labor laws of New Jersey are enforced in the mills, to remove the abominable technical obstacle against the enforcement of the women's night work law (an obstacle for which the Passaic wool manufacturers are largely responsible), to help educate the great mass of non-English speaking workers—to suggest only two or three of the more obvious and crying needs of the working people in Passaic. Since Passaic, because of the tragically low wages paid to men, contains a larger proportion of women wage earners, and of working mothers, than any of the cities studied by the United States Women's Bureau, it would seem to me that the town is a peculiarly neglected field offering jobs adapted to almost anybody's personality.

AGNES DE LIMA.

Valley Cottage, N. Y.

Chicago Needs a Jailer

SIR: Following serious outbreaks and infractions of discipline among the inmates of the Chicago jail, including a bomb explosion intended for a jail delivery, smuggling of liquor, drugs, dope and devices for making jail deliveries, the Sheriff, Peter M. Hoffman, at the suggestion of Judge John P. McGoorty, judge of the criminal court of Chicago, has appointed a citizens' committee to conduct a civil service examination for qualified persons to fill positions of trust in the county jail. This committee is now engaged in planning for the examination to be held for the filling of the position of superintendent of the jail.

The position of superintendent carries with it a salary of five thousand dollars a year. The position is one of appointment by the sheriff of the county as are all other positions in the jail service. In the absence of statutory provision for civil service, the citizens' committee has the fullest assurance that the lists of individuals certified by the committee as a result of examinations will be accepted by the sheriff and the persons standing highest on the respective lists will be appointed.

The examination will be open to citizens of the United States. The committee desires all possible advice and assistance in securing the names of men with education, training and experience particularly fitting them for this important position. The examination will be held in the near future, and it is desirable that persons throughout the United States, capable and obtainable to participate in this examination, should have the information regarding this opportunity.

A timely element involved in the situation is that plans are completed and funds available for the building of a new county jail, located in a desirable part of the community with opportunity for the application of all modern features and methods of jail administration. A competent superintendent of the present jail may look forward to a most enviable opportunity for service in this particular and most neglected field of penology. Address the writer at 10 S. La Salle St.

F. D. LOOMIS,
Chairman, Advisory Committee.

Chicago, Ill.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labor's Outlook to Life

The Philosophy of Labor, by C. Delisle Burns. New York: Oxford University Press. 126 pages. $1.40.

WORKERS' education has already been responsible for a new ingredient in trade unionism; its next advance is likely to be formulated in terms of a new motivation of the worker's intelligence with respect to public affairs. Trade unions move forward by one of two paths: coercion or reason. So long as the "toilworn craftsman" was honored because he was toilworn and venerated for "the hard hand" rather than the rational head, trade unions were bound to emphasize force at the expense of intelligence. In consequence the world of labor has on its hands a corps of older leaders (significantly called "war-horses") who possess highly-developed habits of conflict and almost none for coöperation. This fact explains in part why trade union meetings are poorly attended when no conflict is imminent; why, in short, trade unionism has only recently shown signs of becoming a creative force. Periods of peace between strikes are too frequently regarded as mere static intermissions, cessations of trade union functions.

This misconception of organized labor's office proceeds from two sources: the worker seldom makes proper claims on behalf of his intelligence, and those who control public and industrial affairs have not, either because of their own lack of intelligence or because they feared loss of power, sought to utilize workers' wisdom. Mr. C. Delisle Burns, in this fine-spoken and prophetic book, transposes the factors of the equation: he contends that it is peculiarly the worker's point of view which should predominate—not merely in affairs of industry but in the life of communities. "The workers *are* the community. No valid contrast can be drawn between community and workers, for those who do not work have no part at all in the life of the community." But, he does not mean that workers as a class are to be dictators, for this would be a contradiction in terms. He wants power to radiate from the workers' point of view and not from workers as a class. This complex of attitudes, dispositions and capacities which emerges as a unified point of view is still latent and inarticulate. Mr. Burns's book is chiefly valuable for designating the sources and stimulations from which the point of view is likely to arise and for indicating its probable levels of emergence.

The worker's point of view, i. e., the primary indicator of his personality, is first of all a correlate of physical functions. The "sense of free play of energy in manual labor," the worker's contribution of his own energy to the common life, has its psychological correlation in the feeling of indispensability; he knows that his labors support civilization and consequently he comes to live in an atmosphere of solidity; what he does partakes both of social necessity and social value and hence is transfused with meaning. Besides, he performs his tasks with a sense of fellowship. "The association of workers conscious of one another as workers is the ground of the characteristic worker's point of view. . . ." He performs social services socially. And finally, even the manual worker, whether he recognizes it or not, participates in a "mental" process. "He does not think of himself as a tool," but feels his kinship with those who create. Or, as Leonard Woolf suggested in Coöperation and the Future of Industry, we all tend to become experts about something. "Work is in essence an enterprise, an adventure, an outlet for energy, a form of vitality; secondly, it is a binding force of society, a service, a coöperation, a fellowship," says Burns, and we should all like to agree with him. Obviously, considerable numbers of workers who manipulate automatic machines will experience difficulty in sensing or feeling any such glow of romance in their work, and this Mr. Burns readily acknowledges; he also relies upon education—"a practical extension of intelligence over the whole field of labor"—as the force which will evoke, clarify and instrumentalize the worker's point of view.

Since all manual work is in part mental and all mental work manual, it follows that the vicious separation of intellectual and manual workers must be abandoned. Thinking is a function of the total organism and "cannot be the function of an exclusive caste." The primary service of those who specialize in thinking is to provide leadership and criticism; they may lead in the sense that they interpret and speculate and criticize; they may also serve as delegates or representatives for labor if representation is conceived as a special ability and not as superior wisdom or power.

A philosophy of labor such as Mr. Burns conceives and portrays would, if it rose to the level of consciousness and action, bring new qualities to our civilization. It would confront the problem of poverty and riches realistically, that is, by experiments which would utilize different impulses and desires. "In competition the power of each is limited by the power of the other," and it therefore follows "that the way to increase freedom is to socialize the organization of industry." National allegiance, patriotism, would, under the dispensation of this point of view, pass through a new refinement. Simple and barbaric nationalism would be transformed into a patriotism of service. Likewise, as workers of various countries respond to their unities, a new motive for international good will is sure to come into being. And in the end, this philosophy of labor will come to be the solvent for the wasteful conflict between those who seek progress through reform and those who advocate revolution. "The real revolution is a transformation of attitude and outlook, expressing itself in new kinds of action" and "the real value of reform is that it is a cause of revolution; and the test of a good revolution is that it can use the results and continue to use the methods of reform." The older revolutionists erred because they promised an impossible end, a concluded process. By the same token the older reformists were mistaken because they failed to regard their reforms as preparatory to and parts of an on-going revolution. Thus, the reformer who disavows revolution, is in all likelihood a disguised reactionary, and the revolutionist who disdains reform is probably compensating for his inability to deal with present realities.

The quality of Mr. Burns's book has been partially revealed by the liberal use of quotations in the above paragraphs, but I feel impelled to make additional commendations. Simplicity of style, clarity of thought and directness of approach are natural modes of expression for this thinker, as those of us know who have followed his previous work; the unexpected element in this essay is, however, a warmth of feeling and enthusiasm for this thesis. Everything he says makes for "a finer contact between persons" because of that thin shade of fervor which assures the reader that this is not merely an intellectual feat but rather the fulness of expression of a whole man. The prophetic qualities of this volume will appeal, not only to labor leaders and industrialists, but to all who look forward hopefully to a society more civilized, more interesting and more varied than the present.

EDUARD C. LINDEMAN.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Brutal Facts

The International Anarchy, 1904-1914, by G. Lowes Dickinson. New York: The Century Company. 505 pages. $3.50.

THE tendencious books on the World War and its origins which were written during the conflict or immediately after its close have been thrown so far out of date by more recent revelations that their chief value now is as dreadful object lessons in the art of jumping at conclusions on insufficient evidence. It is not, to be sure, quite fair to point the finger of scorn at the writers of a few years ago. Not only were they still in the grip of war psychology, but they were forced to base their conclusions on documents which were usually insufficient and often garbled. There is, however, no denying that they accomplished two highly undesirable things.

In the first place, they frequently distorted the facts—sometimes because the facts were largely inaccessible, sometimes for less creditable reasons—and thus impressed upon the public a false notion of international realities. In the second place, having once planted a series of half-truths in the public mind, they also produced a tendency to discount future revelations as mere propaganda, while the voluminousness of the writings about the War produced a reaction unfavorable to any further discussion of diplomacy, or of the forces that produce war. With an excusable weariness, the public shut its mind at the very moment when the most important facts were still to come. It was very bad for the public, and is probably going to be even worse for the public's small children, who are likely to reap the bitter fruit of present indifference.

The trouble with what most of us believed during the War was not that it was in itself untrue, but that it was only half the truth. German diplomats—with abundant justification—were made out to be terrible fellows; but by adroit silence it was also suggested that their colleagues on the other side were straightforward, ingenuous chaps, intent solely upon making sweetness and light prevail.

In his new book, The International Anarchy, Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson bluntly asserts that in pre-war diplomacy everybody was about as bad as everybody else—and that the Germans were at least no worse. "Is it not time we stopped our disputes about who was the good or the bad boy," he asks, "and began at last to take stock of the real situation?"

He has, therefore, made a critical re-survey of the ominous decade preceding the War, employing all the new data now available, and he has produced one of the finest studies of pre-war diplomacy that has yet appeared. Innumerable other books deal with the same field, but only one or two cover such a range of facts with such fairness or conciseness, and none makes so plain the application of those facts to the post-war period in which we live.

Absence of bias is the most refreshing quality of International Anarchy. Too often the writer whose eyes have been opened by exposure of Allied diplomacy flies to the opposite extreme and will believe no good of his own side. Not so Mr. Dickinson, whose only bias is for peace and whose only passion is for the truth. He refrains from those cheap flings and jeers which make so much post-war discussion of war origins almost as irritating as the most unblushing propaganda. Good, sound, dignified writing is always a merit but never more so than in a controversial work.

Mr. Dickinson believes that wars arise "from the juxtaposition of a number of states, independent and armed, which struggle for power, compete in armaments, seek expansion, indulge in diplomatic juggling, and end in war." After the disaster has come, he warns us, "the machine, after a brief halt, starts again to run along the old lines to the old disaster."

But though he is clear-eyed and fearless, Mr. Dickinson is by no means hopeless. Only, he believes that we have no time to waste. "The time is short and the danger imminent." The old forces that produced the last War are at work again.

Mr. Dickinson's program for peace is a development of the League into "a true international organ to control in the interest of peace the policies of all states." War must be made completely illegal instead of partially so. There must also be an equitable distribution of raw materials—this comes close to the root of the matter—general abandonment of protective policies, and "all-round disarmament." He suggests, however, no practical means by which all this may be brought about, and he gives comparatively little attention to the more fundamental conflicts of interest of which the tricks of statecraft are only the expression.

Mr. Dickinson's references to spades are uncompromisingly agricultural. There is no beating around the bush. Instead, he writes with a blessed bluntness. A famous Russian statesman "was an accomplished liar." It is perfectly true, and everybody knows it, but few men would dare say as much. Had a certain remark of the Tsar's been made by the Kaiser, "all our historians would have been citing it as a definite proof of the guilt, and the sole guilt, of Germany." This, from a citizen of one of the late belligerent powers is refreshingly frank and candid writing.

JOHN BAKELESS.

Some Flowers Down a Lane

The Selected Poems of Lizette Woodworth Reese. New York: George H. Doran Company. 187 pages. $2.

MISS REESE has been singing quietly for many years. Now, with a sense that the day is waning, she has just as quietly issued her Selected Poems. We can read over in these few pages what she hopes we will keep of her gentle song, spun in an old-time garden by a firm heart heavy with nostalgia. Some of these poems are already familiar. The new ones have the same simplicity of speech and the same motifs: separation, loneliness, remembrance of lost love and the beauty of familiar things. Amid the box hedges and colonial chimneys of the old East Shore of Maryland these poems have taken refuge from the "brawling days" of our American life. The fragile sturdiness of hollyhocks is in their pages. She is living now before the War, and her voice comes bravely from behind a soft gray veil.

It is inevitable that her poems should have something of the deliberation of box hedges. In her lonely days she has learned to love the bordered paths, the bees in lavender, the poplar trees across the road. These things are fragrant with the sweet earth, but they are also tamed. They do not grow carelessly where the sun invites them. Miss Reese is close enough to the earth to have its healthy sweetness, but her poetry, like her garden, has been set out and trimmed. It never opens effortlessly in the grass like spring hepathicas, nor flares, like sumac, unexpectedly upon a hill. It is the view from the front window:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is no loveliness so plain
As a tall poplar in the rain.

But oh, the hundred things and more
That come in at the door!
The smack of mint, old joy, old pain,
Caught in the gray and tender rain.

The praise of "common things" runs through all the volume and is full of murmured affection; it never attains the sudden breathlessness which makes Edna Millay's poems of familiar things flutter so poignantly in the imagination, and escape in the same moment they are grasped.

The remembrance of past losses lingers for Miss Reese in the scent of intimate flowers. In lyrics and sonnets she sings all the moods of sad memories staunchly borne—for within her garden she is a stoic. She has traced the diminuendo of grief through its gradual subsiding, until it becomes the infrequent stab brought we no longer know just why, by an encounter of odor or gleaming briar. It is always the echo of grief we find in her pages; she has nowhere impaled on stripped and vibrant words, as a freer poet would have, the agony of grief itself. Even grief speaks behind the soft gray veil.

As if she were aware that as a poet she had been denied the unashamed nakedness she feels the need of, she has made an appeal to Life:

Unpetal the flower of me,
And cast it to the gust;
Betray me if you will;
Trample me to dust.

But that I should go bare,
But that I should go free
Of any hurt at all—
Do not this thing to me!

The words are themselves a confession that in spite of her stoic willingness the appeal had already been rejected. To realize their limitation one has only to place them beside another poem by Edna Millay: those twelve ultimate lines entitled Feast.

I drank at every vine.
The last was like the first.
I came upon no wine
So wonderful as thirst.

Miss Millay's poem rises to an assertion of ecstasy, Miss Reese's remains a prayer. She writes with feeling, with clear intelligence, with sensitiveness to every gentle beauty. The wilder beauties lie, of course, outside her garden. And even within her garden, in spite of her stoic love of loveliness, and her patient searching for clean simple words, the piercing phrase which trembles in revealment has never blinded her page.

Time will make an even more rigorous selection of her works than she has made. It will discard her sonnets to dead poets and the other short poems whose inspiration is literary. But it will keep a handful of her songs of the "gray and tender rain," and two or three sonnets, including certainly The Look of the Hedge and that splendid one with its Shakespearean first line, "When I consider Life and its few years." To have compelled this much of a nod from Time is an accomplishment.

LAWRENCE S. MORRIS.

The James Boys

The Rise and Fall of Jesse James, by Robertus Love. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 446 pages. $2.75.

THE James boys were really good boys, but nobody would allow them to be good. They got off to a bad start, and had to keep on in the same direction, much as they might have preferred another, or be hanged. More than any other one cause, the Civil War was to blame. Kansas and Missouri were the scene of deeds which we, who like to think of the Civil War as, among wars, an unusually chivalrous one, are likely to forget. It was in these two states that normal warfare degenerated into guerrilla raids of the most uncouth violence, and the bands operating under Quantrill, Anderson and Todd committed atrocities which compare favorably with the late unpleasantness or the even less civilized Balkan affairs. Galloping into Lawrence, Kansas, in August, 1863, with 450 men, Quantrill "ordered every male citizen shot to death and the houses of the people put to the torch. . . . The guerrillas murdered 182 men that day." A year later Anderson and Todd cavalry killed two hundred raw Federal recruits, with the loss of only one of their own number.

It was under such men and in such times as these that Frank and Jesse James grew up. Mr. Love has unearthed, apparently, all that there is to know about them, with great respect for historical accuracy and considerable narrative skill. A large literature has grown up about the James boys, much of it fantastic exaggeration, and Mr. Love is at pains to burrow through this to what is actually known—which is not a great deal. There is great doubt as to just which of the series of robberies and hold-ups in the decade following the war were dignified by the presence of the James brothers. Sometimes Frank's hand is visible, sometimes Jesse's, sometimes it seems likely that both were on the job, but in only a very few cases would Mr. Love or his readers be willing to swear to their complicity. They were often chased, always suspected, but never caught. Jesse was shot by a traitor; Frank, much later, surrendered and was acquitted. Their immunity was partly due to their extreme skill, but no less to the extraordinary sympathy which their figures and careers seem to have aroused. Their intimate and lifelong partners, Jim and Cole Younger, shared this enthusiasm. When the Youngers were in jail in Minnesota, a certain Captain Warren Carter Bronaugh made it his life's work to set them free. The captain was married in 1882, and on his wedding journey headed straight for Minnesota to see the Youngers, who had been in jail there for six years.

Mr. Love's account of the bank hold-up in Minnesota and the long pursuit which ended so disastrously for all hands but the James brothers is a thriller, and his handling of the less-remembered feats is always interesting. He recounts perhaps five or six bank hold-ups in some detail. The main outlines are usually the same. A band of mounted men enter a small town. If they are as few as three, they do so circumspectly, drawing up peacefully before the bank, shooting the cashier only occasionally, firing upon the citizens if necessary and riding off with the bonds and currency in grain sacks about a quarter of an hour ahead of inferiorly mounted revenge. If the robbers are as many as ten, they shoot up the town immediately upon their arrival, to the accompaniment of wild guerrilla yells, and keep the natives out of sight with a rain of bullets. The dead are from one to half a dozen, nearly always on the citizens' side. Cruel, useless

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

murders, but what a valiant, what a heroic feat in spite of them! And how uninteresting they are really, and how much alike, how lacking in high skill or bravery—yet how absorbingly interesting to read about! Private violence makes about the best reading matter in the world. Half the popular sympathy for the James boys was because of their unusually attractive, straightforward personalities, but the other half was a little more because of than in spite of their deeds of violence. And a bank, or a railroad does not easily command sympathy.

No railroad in Missouri, by the way, was immune from Frank and Jesse James except the Burlington, which very wisely sent to the mother of the highwaymen, Mrs. Zerelda Samuel, an annual pass good over its entire system.

R. L.

More Forsyte Scandal

The Silver Spoon, by John Galsworthy. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.

MR. GALSWORTHY as a serious novelist develops a main theme from the relation of the individual to institutions, and of these institutions he is chiefly concerned with the family. And it may be added that he finds his sharpest, most revealing test of the family in its relation to the individual and to society, in scandal, actual or threatened. It is to be observed that nearly all his novels and many of his short stories and plays take the pattern of a situation in which an individual sacrifices or is tempted to sacrifice the family mores to personal desires. If Mr. Galsworthy were a Victorian he would settle the problem by the effective device of renunciation: as a modernist he is concerned with the question how far the family will compromise with individual desires, and mediate with society to save face. The Man of Property, The Country House, The Patrician, Fraternity, The Dark Flower, The Freelands, Saints' Progress, The Silver Box, The Elder Son, Loyalties—all are illustrations of this theme. One family in particular, the Forsytes, and one member of it, Soames Forsyte, he has pursued with a pertinacity that suggests conspiracy. In The Man of Property, Soames loses his wife Irene to Philip Bosinnery, in In Chancery, to young Jolyon Forsyte, in To Let he nearly loses his daughter Fleur to the son of Irene and Jolyon; in The White Monkey Fleur, married to Michael Mont, threatens Soames anew. And about this central trunk the collateral branches of the Forsyte family are shaken by the strong and mighty wind, and strew their leaves with a rustling of suspicions, which are the overtones of the dominant note.

In A Silver Spoon Mr. Galsworthy maintains the ordeal by scandal. Soames, Michael and Fleur are once more tested in their relation to each other and to the world by an episode which brings them into court, not this time the court of domestic relations but merely a court of justice. It is not a divorce or a breach of promise which brings them there, but a suit for libel. Although they are technically the defendants, they are really the aggressors, and society is in the dock. But although they win the case, it is a Pyrrhic victory; society is in the end the stronger. Soames Forsyte, through his love for his daughter, is once more a beaten man.

The main interest of the story lies in the contrast between the Soames Forsyte of these later days and him of the Man of Property. We cannot charge Mr. Galsworthy with malevolence in his pursuit of Soames; he is too gentle and bland; and, moreover, in the second Forsyte series he obviously intends to show how the sense of possession which made Soames a frozen egotist in his relation to his first wife becomes the basis of generosity and a certain chivalry toward his daughter. The other characters tend to fade gracefully out of the picture. Of Soames's second wife, Fleur's mother, Mr. Galsworthy has never been able to make anything. She is French and her life, inner and outer, remains a mystery. The young American who comes into the story with news of Jon and his marriage, and who accidentally gains a foothold in the scandal, turns out likewise of little use. It is as if Mr. Galsworthy found himself on the path so persistently traveled by Henry James, and stopped abruptly. Only with his Soames is he quite at home. They have grown old together and will doubtless continue to make the best of each other as life partners.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

An Epic—Stillborn

From Double Eagle to Red Flag, by General P. N. Krasnoff. Translated by Erik Law-Gisiko, with an introduction by William Gerhardi. New York: Duffield and Company. Two vols. $7.50.

A STUPENDOUS epic of Tsardom, war and Revolution." So much from the blurb. The New York Times, commenting on a German edition, said that "parts of it might have been written by Dostoyevsky or Andreyev. Others by Tolstoy, and still others by Victor Hugo or Cesare Lombroso." Others still might have been written by General Krasnoff in person. We are inclined to credit the 852 pages exclusively to him, with the further warning that the book is neither stupendous nor an epic, nor even a good story, nor even a fourth class performance—for a Russian.

It is a pity, for General Krasnoff, late Ataman of the Don Cossacks, lived through the queer turbulent years he is writing about, and was justified by experience, at any rate, in choosing a canvas as big as the side of a barn. More than likely there was, behind these two volumes, the intention of imitating War and Peace. Regiments, mobs, armies move through decades and across continents. A few people survive until the last chapter, but for the most part our attention is called to crowds on the march. The mere quantity of these figures, and a competence at handling them vividly, which is seldom more than journalistic, are somehow impressive. Where General Krasnoff's training and enthusiasm raise his pages to something approaching literature is in the description of drills, manœuvres and the appearances of the Tsar. Until the revolution there is often a kind of muddled dignity in his pageants, and something touching in his narrow loyalty. But at the first breath of the Red wind across the Eastern front the general's intelligence and sense of direction, never very secure, desert him. From then on the chronicle becomes an increasingly tiresome and heavy-handed attempt to prove to us, by drawing a few stupidly perverted puppets, that all the Bolsheviks were nympho-, pyro- and letho-maniacs. In the general's dreary accumulation of insult and torture there is something quite as sadistic as the acts he is imputing, universally, to the other side, and also a curious absence of passion, as if his hatred of communists were a faulty phonograph record, spinning about alone in a repetitive rut, and crying, crying, crying to be put to peace. There must be many like him on both sides, Red and White, hardened by war and civil war to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any horror of suffering, yet finding a weary fascination in reciting cruelties that barely quicken their own blood.

From Double-Eagle to Red Flag is the ghost and scaffolding of a great novel, which may very well never get written at all. Those who went through the Russian civil war are, between excess of horror or partisanship or the callousness which these can also bring about, not likely to do the job well. A later generation may produce the wiser, kinder eyes that are so necessary for it. People who have seen that reality do not want to write about it. All eyes are toward the future, not only because of what it may contain, but because the immediate past is too horrible to think about. It is hard for us to realize this. If we could realize it, we would never talk about it. Nearly every Russian has seen things which would give us nightmares for the rest of our lives. But we might enjoy nightmares for a change.

R. L.

Notes

The Romany Stain, by Christopher Morley. New York: Doubleday, Page and Company. 273 pages. $2.50.

DEDICATED to Professor Canby, this bundle of notes is collected from The Bowling Green of The Saturday Review, for which they were originally written. Some were sent from France and England, some are leaves from a Long Island notebook to be amplified in subsequent works, some are jottings of New York impressions—apparently the slightest scribbled records, but conveying by what seem fortuitous felicities the subtlest qualities of surroundings and moods, persons and places. This blending of the casual and formal in an intimate art—"I love a good rollicking pedantry now and then"—is as potent a part of Mr. Morley's charm as the whimsicality of his thought. His love for words distracts one not at all from his delight in life and beauty. His sprightly affectations have the exquisite comicality of English Chinoiseries—the remote and stilted become frolicsome and familiar and seem the indispensable curlycues and flourishes that spring from the artist's inextinguible gusto. These familiar and loving studies of places and books, ships—and occasionally men, are Mr. Morley in his most delightful vein, and pleasanter reading would be hard to find.

D. B. W.

They Knew the Washingtons. Translated by the Princess Radziwill. Indianapolis: The Bobbs Merrill Company. 256 pages. $3.

THESE letters of the family of de Maussion, a French renegade who joined Lafayette's expedition to this country, make vivid many phases of the time-blurred personalities and customs of our Revolutionary period. Washington as the perfect statesman and military tactician is almost idolized, but he appears also as a Beau Brummel immensely popular with the ladies and as the man to whom Lafayette owed his pretensions to greatness both here and in France. To the astonishment of Madame de Maussion, women of the new world, led by Mistress Washington, willingly succumb to old age at about forty and signify it by wearing little caps to hide their graying hair. They give vent to a desire for gaiety, however, in their addiction to colored stockings, which they wear with grace, but launder with disastrous effects to original shades. The fruit raised in the colonies is insipid except when preserved, smart frocks are ordered from Philadelphia and funerals, which are almost merry-making assemblies, are responsible for many a romance. The letters ramble on in sprightly fashion depicting the reactions of strangers to the peculiarities of behavior of the new world inhabitants: their despicable treatment of their commander-in-chief, their suspicion of all foreigners, their increasingly intricate difficulties with the slavery question. Whether authentic or not (and the publisher expresses a doubt) this newly-published correspondence adds zest and color to the text-book concepts of American history possessed by most of us.

M. E. U.

Mape: The World of Illusion, by André Maurois; translated by Eric Sutton. New York: D. Appleton and Company. 247 pages. $2.50.

THE writer of Mape is still the brilliant author of Ariel: but these three semi-biographical stories are a second-run of his original inspiration to combine the novel and the biography into a single form; and they do not come off. If the first story succeeds best, it is because the subject is Goethe and, as with Shelley, there is a similar opportunity to bring home with a compact stroke a mass of diffuse experiences. The second story, It Was Monsieur de Balzac's Fault, takes for the short story some of the easy privileges of biography, for it is pure fiction; and the third, a study of Mrs. Siddons, Thomas Lawrence the painter, and Mrs. Siddons's two daughters, full though it is of interesting material, is not quite worked out for its full value: one feels that more might have been made of it. The very title of Mape: the World of Illusion, makes one anticipate much; but the fact that stories belong to the world of illusion, and that people sometimes take refuge in Mape when they can no longer make their environment behave—as M. Maurois's daughter does—is not exactly a new discovery, nor does it add a special flavor to three rather thin pieces of fiction. The puffing out of these stories into a fat, novel-size volume is not, doubtless, the author's fault; but it is little short of scandalous.

L. M.

Contributors

JOHN DEWEY, professor of philosophy at Columbia University, is author of Studies in Logical Theory, School and Society, Democracy and Politics and Human Nature and Conduct, an Introduction to Social Psychology.

SISLEY HUDDLESTON, British journalist, is now Paris correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor.

JOHN MAYNARD KEYNES is editor of the Economic Journal and author of Economic Consequences of the Peace and Monetary Reform. He was the principal representative of the British Treasury at the Paris Peace Conference, and Deputy for Chancellor of the Exchequer on the Supreme Economic Council.

REXFORD GUY TUGWELL, economist and author, collaborated in American Economic Life and the Means of Its Improvement.

JOHN BAKELESS, author of The Origin of the Next War, and Economic Causes of Modern War, was formerly managing editor of The Living Age.

LAWRENCE MORRIS contributes sketches, stories and articles to various magazines.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED